

Michigan Part B Annual Performance Report

As required by 20 U.S.C. 1416
Sec. 616(b)(1) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004*

Submitted to the
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
February 1, 2012

Resubmitted to OSEP on 4/17/12



Office of Special Education

Annual Performance Report Table of Contents

	Page
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development	3
Indicator 1 Graduation.....	8
Indicator 2 Dropout.....	16
Indicator 3 Statewide Assessment	23
Indicator 4A Suspension/Expulsion	37
Indicator 4B Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity	44
Indicator 5 Educational Environments	51
Indicator 6 Preschool Educational Environments	58
Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes	59
Indicator 8 Facilitated Parent Involvement.....	67
Indicator 9 Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability.....	75
Indicator 10 Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories.....	86
Indicator 11 Child Find	97
Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition.....	104
Indicator 13 Secondary Transition	112
Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes	120
Indicator 15 Compliance Findings.....	127
Indicator 16 State Complaints	145
Indicator 17 Hearings Adjudicated.....	150
Indicator 18 Resolution Session Agreements.....	155
Indicator 19 Mediation Agreements	159
Indicator 20 Timely and Accurate Data	164
Acronym List	171
Appendix A Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)	173
Appendix B Disproportionate Representation Business Rules	178
Appendix C Postsecondary Outcomes Survey.....	183

Michigan's FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report (APR) February 2012 Overview

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE), the Office of Special Education (OSE) developed the FFY 2010 (2010-2011) APR in collaboration with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS) as well as other state agency offices and OSE grantees. This APR includes a report of Michigan's progress and/or slippage in meeting the state's "measurable and rigorous targets" found in its State Performance Plan (SPP). The current versions of the SPP and APR can be found on the MDE website at: www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column).

The APR reflects statewide summary data from Michigan's local educational agencies (LEAs) and state agency education programs. There were a total of 848 school districts that submitted student information during the fall 2010 general student data collection. Students with individualized education programs (IEPs) were enrolled in 837 of these entities as of the Special Education Annual Child Count Date. Of the 848 districts, 549 were traditional school districts; 242 were charter schools, known in Michigan as public school academies (PSAs); and 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs)/educational service agencies (ESAs). State agency education programs include the Michigan School for the Deaf and educational programs operated by Michigan's Departments of Community Health, Corrections and Human Services. Over the past several years, the student enrollment in Michigan public schools has declined. This trend is also reflected in the reduction of students with IEPs.

During FFY 2010 the OSE changed its name from the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services to the Office of Special Education. In this document the term "district" or "local" refers to all LEAs, including traditional school districts, charter schools/PSAs and ISDs/ESAs most of which provide direct services to students.

Within each indicator, the number of districts included in the calculations varies depending on the data requirements (e.g., not all districts had a preschool program or a secondary program).

Process Used to Develop the APR

Leadership

The SPP core team membership included the:

- OSE Assistant Director
- OSE Program Accountability, Performance Reporting and Continuous Improvement and Compliance Supervisors
- ECE&FS Supervisor of Preschool and Early Elementary Programs
- OSE Performance Reporting Data and SPP Coordinators
- OSE APR Consultant
- OSE Data Quality Consultant
- OSE support staff

The core team provided global direction and oversight during the development of the APR. The team provided recommendations on the required elements of each indicator report, which contributed to the accuracy and coherence of the final report. The team also addressed specific issues related to individual SPP indicators.

A work team was created for each SPP indicator. Each team had an indicator lead and backup, with data and secretarial support staff. As appropriate, teams included staff from:

- the OSE
- ECE&FS
- Michigan's Mandated Activity Projects¹
- the MDE's Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA)²
- Michigan's Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI)
- external providers of data services to the OSE

The indicator teams examined data, data collection strategies, variables that impacted progress and slippage, and improvement activities.

National Guidance and Support

The following national technical assistance centers, networks and organizations provided the MDE with APR-related consultation and/or resources:

- Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
- Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)
- Data Accountability Center (DAC) (includes the former National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM))
- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center
- Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC)
- Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
- National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY)
- National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)
- National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)
- National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) Center for Applied Special Technology (NIMAS-CAST)
- National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO)
- National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)
- North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC)
- State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center

National center guidance is evident throughout the APR. Staff turned to the centers for guidance in tasks such as alignment with the NCSEAM's eight general supervision components and revisions to the indicator measurement table.

¹ Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) administrative set-aside funds

² Formerly known as the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability

Stakeholder Involvement

The Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)³, partner organizations and parent networks provided stakeholder input. A description of stakeholder involvement is presented in the Part B SPP Overview (February 2012 Update/Revisions).

Data Systems and Improvements

This year's APR continues to reflect improved data entry, collection, verification and analysis practices. The OSE collaborated with the following data systems' technical experts to ensure compliance with all data collection requirements:

- The BAA coordinated statewide student assessment data.
- The CEPI enhanced the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) to
 1. Accommodate the collection of the Special Education Annual Child Count
 2. Accommodate the collection of preschool outcomes data
 3. Enable districts to verify discipline data in a secure manner consistent with the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* and Michigan's *Identity Theft Protection Act*.
- Interagency Information Systems shifted from serving as the collection mechanism for the Special Education Child Count to an optional vendor exporting and uploading to the MSDS structure. They also updated the MDE public reporting Web structures in order to support review of the data.
- Public Sector Consultants assisted with the alignment of the data elements feeding into the public reporting database, the *Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook* and the Determinations data set.
- Wayne State University's Center for Urban Studies maintained data portals for local and state views of disproportionate representation, parent involvement and postsecondary outcomes data. The summary district level parent involvement data are now available to the public.
- The HighScope Educational Research Foundation supported the analysis of preschool outcomes data.

Monitoring and Reporting

The OSE continued its implementation of the CIMS. Electronic *CIMS Workbooks* were issued in August, December and April providing districts with information about their performance on key compliance and results indicators. Findings of noncompliance were issued through the *CIMS Workbook* based on data reviews and focused monitoring activities.

To ensure timely correction of findings, districts were required to submit corrective action plans within 60 days of findings being issued. The OSE reviewed and approved each corrective action plan. Districts submitted progress reports per an established calendar and were required to request close-out within the CIMS once all activities were completed. The OSE verified correction of noncompliance. Verification included correction of each individual case of noncompliance and a review of new data submissions to determine whether or not the district was correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements and changes in their

³ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel

policies, procedures and practices. Districts were notified of the status of their corrective action plans within the *CIMS Workbook*. Technical assistance was provided throughout the year to ensure correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year, including verification (see Appendix A).

Collaboration among LEAs, ISDs and State Entities

Given federal expectations for increasing alignment between the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) and the IDEA, the OSE enhanced collaboration and coordination with districts and state agencies. The OSE continued to expand and improve communication systems with stakeholders involved in implementing the IDEA and the ESEA. For example, regular community of practice calls, webinars and face-to-face meetings with ISD special education directors and monitors occurred throughout the year. The OSE, in partnership with organizations such as the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education⁴ and Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association, provided workshops, information at general membership meetings and webinars. These efforts resulted in improved general supervision and student outcomes.

Public Reporting

Michigan's 2011 IDEA public reporting on the performance of individual districts on required indicators (Indicators 1-5 and 7-12) was accomplished through:

- Collaboration with stakeholder groups—The OSE collaborated with groups such as the SEAC, the Michigan Alliance for Families⁵ and the OSE Data Advisory Committee regarding the content and format of the public reports.
- Shared leadership with ISDs—The OSE collaborated with ISD personnel to provide information to district staff and the public.
- General announcement—A Michigan Department of Education Deputy Superintendent sent a memorandum to all superintendents and PSA administrators forecasting the availability of public reporting.
- District preview of public reporting—The OSE assured that districts had ample opportunity to preview the data. The preview period enabled districts to prepare communications for their communities and plans for improvement. A memorandum was sent to all special education listservs, including PSAs, when the data were available to the public.
- Media advisory—The MDE's Office of Communications distributed a media advisory announcing the availability of public reporting.
- Posting on the MDE website at: www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column). On May 27, 2011 the OSE posted individual districts' performance on the required indicators with comparisons to state or federal targets and state performance. For some indicator reports, comparisons with up to three other districts are possible. This posting also provided the opportunity to easily view a district's performance across all indicators, in a spreadsheet format.

⁴ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council of Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children

⁵ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)

Public reporting on Michigan's performance was supplemented by posting the current APR and one-page executive summaries (called "Special Education Facts") for each indicator on the MDE website at: www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column, and then look in the "Indicator Resources" section). On the Center for Educational Networking (CEN) website at: www.cenmi.org, click on the link in the left column. The 2010-2011 updates of these documents will be placed on the websites following submission of the FFY 2010 APR to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

Michigan's 2012 IDEA public reporting on the performance of individual districts on the required indicators will be accomplished through a similar process. The anticipated date for FFY 2010 public reporting posting on the MDE website is May 2012.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 1 (Graduation) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In March 2009 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) revised the indicator language and measurement methodology to align with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA).
3. The OSEP revisions also included a one-year data lag for this indicator. Therefore, 2009-2010 data are reported in this FFY 2010 APR submission.
4. Michigan school districts determined graduation requirements locally, and the number and type of credits required varied widely. For 2010 graduates, the only state graduation requirement was one-half credit in civics. The class of 2011 will be required to meet the required Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC). Information about the MMC is available at the following link:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/FAQ - Entire Document 12.07 217841 7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/FAQ_-_Entire_Document_12.07_217841_7.pdf)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁶/Graduation

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

⁶ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Calculations using <i>Leaver Graduation Rate Methodology</i>			
2004	69.7%		
2005		80.0%	70.6%
2006		80.0%	69.0%
2007		80.0%	69.3%
Calculations using <i>Cohort Four-Year Graduation Rate Methodology</i> and using OSEP's Prescribed One Year Data Lag			
2008 (using 2007-2008 school year data)	58.0%	80.0%	58.0%
2009 (using 2008-2009 school year data)		80.0%	57.3%
2010 (using 2009-2010 school year data)		80.0%	57.4%*
Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs who entered ninth grade in 2006-2007 and received a regular diploma within four years) divided by the (total # of youth with IEPs in the cohort)] times 100.			
*[9,243 ÷ 16,091] X 100			

Sources: Single Record Student Database, Michigan Student Data System, Graduation and Dropout Review and Comment Application, Student Record Maintenance

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 graduation rate target of 80 percent. The four year cohort graduation rate for FFY 2010 was 57.4 percent, and was a slight increase over the FFY 2009 rate of 57.3 percent.

This graduation rate (57.4 percent) describes the result for students with IEPs who completed high school in four years. The FFY 2009 cohort five-year graduation rate is 66 percent. The extra year provides students with IEPs additional time to meet graduation requirements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	<p>1. Implement evidence-based practices to improve student outcomes, i.e., graduation and postsecondary outcomes.</p>	<p>Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to American College Testing (ACT) College Readiness Standards, the largest predictors of postsecondary readiness are eighth grade reading scores. Middle schools receiving assistance from MiBLSi were provided professional development (PD) in literacy attainment, the adoption of positive behavior supports, and fidelity of implementation contributing to a narrower reading gap and improved student outcomes. <p>The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To select evidence based practices, increased requests for and technical assistance (TA) received from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), National Post-School Outcomes Center, National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) and Regional Resource Centers regarding Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14. A practice identified was the NSTTAC planning tool for implementation. • Provided PD regarding consistent use of a problem solving tool to identify underlying causes of poor system and student performance. These PD opportunities supported the quality of exit decisions for future graduates whose diplomas are dependent on meeting the requirements of the MMC. • Provided updates to all learning modules, TA, coaching and PD to achieve high levels of compliance and improved supports for students with IEPs. <p>The Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA), the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation, and the Office of Special Education (OSE) created a Michigan Online Professional</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>Learning System. The <i>Engaging Students in Mathematical and English Language Arts Practices and Supporting Student Proficiency</i> modules are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide schools and districts with a robust, research-based, job-embedded professional learning system • Assist and support instruction for students in grades 2-8 who are struggling in mathematics and English language arts, and • Provide a strong connection to Career- and College-Readiness Standards to ensure that students are able to graduate with a high school diploma.
2008-2011	<p>2. Implement the Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) initiative as a strategy to increase graduation and decrease dropout rates.</p>	<p>RTSL is an improvement initiative charged with identifying high leverage dropout prevention practices that positively impact students with disabilities. This sampling of middle and high schools provides an opportunity for the OSE discovery of the policies, procedures and practices that increase the likelihood that students with IEPs will be on track for graduation. Results for middle and high schools were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RTSL cohort 1 high schools participating in school year 2009-2010, all ten high schools outperformed the state's graduation rate of 75.9 percent by 10.6 percent. • For all four middle schools in the same cohort, the students with disabilities subgroup made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics. This academic result increases the likelihood that, once they attend high school, they will be on track to graduate.
2009-2011	<p>3. Scale up MiBLSi at the secondary level.</p>	<p>In 2010-2011, 85 middle schools participated in MiBLSi's integrated behavior and reading project. In terms of scaling up, MiBLSi moved to a district wide plan rather than working with individual schools.</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	4. Embed into Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) a process for districts to review and analyze graduation data and conduct a root cause analysis.	<p>The CIMS website provides resources to districts that link the data and practices specific to Indicators 1, 2, 8, 13, and 14.</p> <p>The <i>CIMS Workbook</i> contains district data for local Review and Analysis Process teams to use in completing their root cause analyses and develop improvement activities to increase graduation rates.</p>
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2005-2011	5. Continue collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center (NDPC). Receive TA from the NDPC.	Building upon work presented at the NDPC-SD 2009 Spring NSTTAC conference, the following Mandated Activities Projects ⁷ (MAPs): RTSL, MI-TOP, Michigan Alliance for Families ⁸ , Michigan Special Education Mediation Project, Low Incidence Outreach, and Project Find, designed a spring 2010 conference emphasizing the role of parent leadership in graduation and dropout prevention planning. This conference offered PD to RTSL building teams.
2008-2011	6. Initiate collaborative work with the Office of School Improvement and key education stakeholders to integrate special education practices developed for students receiving special education services known to support school completion into common educational practice across the state.	<p>Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals representatives served on the Michigan Department of Education Dropout Challenge workgroup to support state level improvement in graduation.</p> <p>Michigan Department of Education staff from the newly formed High School Unit conducted strategic planning sessions with MI-TOP, RTSL, and the Dropout Challenge workgroup to assure that graduation and dropout prevention goals align with secondary-level school improvement strategies.</p> <p>Graduation rates for the schools participating in the <i>Superintendent's Dropout Challenge</i>, when compared to all other Michigan high schools, were ten percent higher for the 2009-2010 school year. The OSE requested support to</p>

⁷ Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

⁸ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)

Timelines	Activities	Status
		discover the practices that may have contributed to this difference.
2008-2011	7. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • Michigan’s MAPs • Michigan’s emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	Data based decision-making resources with probe questions across Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 have been inserted into the CIMS and Michigan’s MAPs. These systems of support helped districts analyze and improve their performance for all indicators.
2008-2011	8. Work with intradepartmental partners to create consistency in student planning processes.	The OSE was represented on workgroups which developed the compliance requirements of the secondary transition indicator, the use of a personal curriculum; the CIMS probe questions, the MI-TOP emphasis on Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 and the <i>Transition Planning Made Easier</i> module. RTSL and MI-TOP worked with the BAA staff and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation high school consultants to provide TA regarding Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2008-2011	9. Implement standards-based IEP policies and procedures.	The new state model IEP form was implemented and all companion Quick Guides were developed and distributed.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	10. Continue to disseminate local educational agency data reports on graduation rates by	The Center for Educational Performance and Information continued to provide via their website Graduation Cohort Reports that disaggregate data by subgroup such as disability and race/ethnicity. Four and five year

Timelines	Activities	Status
	disability and ethnicity.	graduation cohort rates were made available for the 2009-2010 results.
2008-2011	11. Implement a TA tool that will facilitate districts' analysis of relationships between results and compliance measures.	<p>The RTSL and MI-TOP continued to build decision- making capacity among both the transition coordinators and intermediate school district monitors regarding graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes.</p> <p>Several TA tools included newsletters to transition coordinators, TA documents regarding exit decision-making and other cross-indicator issues such as, summary of performance supports.</p>
2009-2011	12. Develop a guidance document regarding use of the fifth year of high school to support attainment of a regular diploma by students with disabilities. The document will include information that this federally approved option will not affect AYP status.	Transition coordinators received guidance documents regarding exit decision making at the April MI-TOP conference. Topics included personal curriculum resources, <i>Michigan Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook</i> , information regarding the dropout event rate, and four, five, and six year graduation cohort rate connections with district attainment of AYP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due	None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>this indicator are 57.3%. The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator were 58%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80%. The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report.</p>	<p>February 1, 2012.</p>	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 2 (Dropout) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The annual event dropout rate is the rate reported for all Michigan students and subgroups in Michigan’s Consolidated State Performance Report.
3. Michigan’s State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension contains a detailed description of how the event dropout rate is calculated.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁹/Dropout

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

⁹ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Calculations using <i>Leaver Dropout Rate Methodology</i>			
2004	25.5%		
2005		13.0%	25.2%
2006		11.5%	28.9%
2007		10.0%	28.1%
Calculation using <i>Consolidated State Performance Report Event Dropout Rate Methodology</i> ¹⁰ , and using OSEP's Prescribed One Year Data Lag			
2008 (using 2007-2008 school year data)	7.6%	10.0%	7.6%
2009 (using 2008-2009 school year data)		9.5%	7.2%
2010 (using 2009-2010 school year data)		9.0%	6.1%*
Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school in one year) divided by the (# of youth with IEPs who were enrolled in grades 9-12 in the same year)] times 100. This includes students ages 14-21 who were in ungraded programs and matched by age to grades 9-12.			
*[4,244 ÷ 69,610] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Student Data System, Graduation and Dropout Review and Comment Application, Student Record Maintenance

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan met its FFY 2010 dropout target of 9.0 percent or less for youth with IEPs. The 6.1 percent dropout event rate is a one-year snapshot of youth with IEPs who dropped out during the 2009-2010 school year, which is a 1.1 percent decrease from the previous year. For three consecutive APR reporting periods, Michigan met its increasingly rigorous targets. While these positive results indicate progress over time, it is unclear how the Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC) for the Class of 2011 will influence the FFY 2011 event dropout rate. In order to align with graduation, Michigan plans to report a cohort dropout rate in the FFY 2011 APR and update the SPP Extension accordingly.

¹⁰ The new methodology makes the two rates not comparable

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
<p>2006-2011</p>	<p>1. Develop and implement best practices leading to graduation and successful transition to postsecondary roles.</p>	<p>Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to American College Testing (ACT) College Readiness Standards, the largest predictor of postsecondary readiness is an eighth grade reading score. Middle schools receiving assistance from MiBLSi were provided professional development (PD) in literacy attainment, the adoption of positive behavior supports, and fidelity of implementation contributing to a narrower reading gap in 15 middle schools. <p>The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To select evidence based practices, increased requests for and technical assistance (TA) received from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), National Post-School Outcomes Center, National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) and Regional Resource Centers regarding Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14. A practice identified was the NSTTAC planning tool for implementation. • Provided PD regarding consistent use of a problem solving tool to identify underlying causes of poor system and student performance. These PD opportunities supported the quality of exit decisions for future graduates whose diplomas are dependent on meeting the requirements of the MMC. • Provided updates to new and existing learning modules, TA, coaching and PD to achieve high levels of compliance and improved supports for students with IEPs. <p>The Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA), the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation, and the Office of Special Education (OSE) engaged in creating a Michigan Online</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>Professional Learning System. The <i>Engaging Students in Mathematical and English Language Arts Practices and Supporting Student Proficiency</i> modules are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide schools and districts with a robust, research-based, job-embedded professional learning system. • Assist and support instruction for students in grades 2-8 who are struggling in mathematics and English language arts. • Provide a strong connection to Career- and College-Readiness Standards to ensure that students are able to graduate with a high school diploma.
2008-2011	<p>2. Implement the Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) initiative as a strategy to increase graduation and decrease dropout rates.</p>	<p>RTSL is an improvement initiative charged with identifying high leverage dropout prevention practices that positively impact students with disabilities. This sampling of middle and high schools provides an opportunity for the OSE discovery of the policies, procedures and practices that increase the likelihood of students with IEPs to be on track for graduation. Results for middle and high schools were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RTSL cohort 1 high schools participating in school year 2009-2010, all ten high schools outperformed the state's graduation rate of 75.9 percent by 10.6 percent. In addition, eight of the ten schools made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and nine made AYP in mathematics for all students including students with IEPs. • For all four middle schools in the same cohort, the students with disabilities subgroup made AYP in reading and mathematics. This academic result increases the likelihood that, once they attend high school, they will be on track to graduate. All of these schools met the attendance target for AYP as well.
2009-2011	<p>3. Fully implement and scale up MiBLSi at the secondary level.</p>	<p>In 2010-2011, 85 middle schools participated in MiBLSi's integrated behavior and reading project. In terms of scaling up, MiBLSi moved to a district wide plan rather than working with individual schools.</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	4. Embed into Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) a process for local educational agencies (LEAs) to review and analyze graduation data and conduct a root cause analysis.	<p>The CIMS website provides resources to districts that links the data and practices specific to Indicators 1, 2, 8, 13, and 14.</p> <p>The <i>CIMS Workbook</i> contains district data for local Review and Analysis Process teams to use in completing their root cause analyses and develop improvement activities to decrease dropout rates.</p>
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2006-2011	5. Continue collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center (NDPC). Receive TA from the NDPC.	Building upon work presented at the NDPC-SD 2009 Spring NSTTAC conference, the following Mandated Activity Projects ¹¹ (MAPs): RTSL, MI-TOP, Michigan Alliance for Families ¹² , Michigan Special Education Mediation Project, Low Incidence Outreach and Project Find, designed a spring 2011 conference, emphasizing parent leadership in graduation and dropout prevention planning. This conference offered PD to RTSL building teams.
2006-2011	6. Develop strategic initiatives through the Parent Involvement grant that focus on reducing dropout rates.	In addition to the spring 2011 conference, the OSE supported a community leadership forum to help the improvement initiatives focus on parent involvement to improve student results at both the elementary and secondary level.
2008-2011	7. Work with intra-departmental partners to create consistency in student planning processes.	<p>The OSE was represented on workgroups which developed the compliance requirements of the secondary transition indicator, the use of a personal curriculum; the CIMS probe questions, the MI-TOP emphasis on Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 and the <i>Transition Planning Made Easier</i> module.</p> <p>RTSL and MI-Top worked with the BAA staff and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation high school consultants to provide TA regarding Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14.</p>

¹¹ Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

¹² Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)

Timelines	Activities	Status
2008-2011	8. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • Michigan’s MAPs • Michigan’s emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	Data based decision-making resources with probe questions across Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 have been inserted into the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> and the work of Michigan’s MAPs. These systems of support helped districts to analyze and improve their performance for all indicators.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2008-2011	9. Implement standards-based IEP policies and procedures.	The OSE implemented the new model state IEP form and all companion ‘Quick Guides’ were developed and distributed.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	10. Continue to disseminate LEA data reports on dropout rates by disability and ethnicity.	The Center for Educational Performance and Information continued to provide via their website disaggregated data, including dropout rates by subgroup such as disability and race/ethnicity. Special education personnel can access the district event rate through the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> .
2008-2011	11. Implement a TA tool that will facilitate districts’ analysis of relationships between results and compliance measures.	The RTSL and MI-TOP continued to build decision- making capacity among both the transition coordinators and intermediate school district monitors regarding graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes. Several TA tools included newsletters to transition coordinators, TA documents regarding exit decision making and other cross-indicator issues. MI-TOP conferences addressed cross-indicator results.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2009-2011	12. Develop a guidance document regarding use of the fifth year of high school to support the attainment of a regular diploma. The document will include information that this federally approved option will not affect Adequate Yearly Progress status.	Transition coordinators received TA documents regarding exit decision making at the April MI-TOP conference. Topics included personal curriculum resources, <i>Michigan Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook</i> , information regarding the dropout event rate, and fact sheets about the opportunity for districts to make AYP by achieving an 80 percent graduation cohort rate through their fourth, fifth, or sixth year graduation data.
2009-2011	13. Increase participation in the components of Michigan's <i>Superintendent's Dropout Challenge</i> .	In order to increase school and district participation in Michigan's <i>Superintendent's Dropout Challenge</i> , the challenge workgroup requested that the American Institutes for Research /Great Lakes East compare the results of the first group of challenge high schools to all other Michigan high schools. The results for the challenge high schools indicated a statistically significant improvement in graduation and dropout rates. Based on this positive data, Michigan requested and was selected to receive intensive support from the NDPC-SD.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 7.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 7.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 9.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 3 (Statewide Assessment) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Michigan's Educational Assessment System is comprised of the following state assessments: the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for students in grades 3-8, the Michigan Merit Examination for students in grade 11, Michigan's alternate assessment program based on alternate achievement standards (MI-Access), Michigan's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards (MEAP-Access) and the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA). Michigan's English language arts and mathematics assessments received approval through the U.S. Department of Education (USED) peer review process. MEAP-Access is undergoing the peer review process and will be operational again in fall 2011.
3. District Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): A school district is considered to have made AYP if the district makes AYP in both reading and mathematics at one of the three grade ranges (elementary, middle or high school).
4. Michigan's assessment results are available to the public at:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html

<p>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹³/Statewide Assessment</p>
--

<p>(Results Indicator)</p>

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with individualized education programs (IEPs) on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state's minimum "n" size that meet the state's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

¹³ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurement:

A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

Table 1: A — Districts Meeting AYP Objectives for Disability Subgroup

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	100%		
2006		88.0%	92.7%
2007		91.0%	98.5%
2008		94.0%	99.4%
2009		97.0%	99.7%
2010		98.0%	96.6%*

Percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the state’s minimum “n” size that meet the state’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the state’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

*[370 ÷ 383] x 100

Source: Michigan Department of Education (MDE)/Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA)

APR – Part B

Michigan

Table 2: B - Participation — Participation of 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; and alternate assessment against modified achievement standards¹⁴.

Participation Rate	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8		Grade 11	
	Reading	Math												
a. # of Children with IEPs in assessed grades ^{15,16}	14,542	14,533	16,065	16,059	16,331	16,328	15,850	15,852	15,853	15,845	15,866	15,857	13,594	13,587
b. # and % of Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	9,118 62.7%	7,491 51.5%	9,641 60.0%	7,305 45.5%	9,502 58.2%	6,677 40.9%	9,805 61.9%	6,205 39.1%	9,834 62.0%	6,590 41.6%	9,949 62.7%	6,698 42.2%	3,245 23.9%	2,358 17.4%
c. # and % of Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,494 17.2%	4,311 29.7%	3,199 19.9%	5,827 36.3%	3,657 22.4%	6,680 40.9%	2,918 18.4%	6,628 41.8%	2,846 18.0%	6,090 38.4%	2,730 17.2%	6,003 37.9%	6,751 49.7%	7,531 55.4%
d. # and % of Children with IEPs in alt. assessment against grade level standards	Not Applicable													
e. # and % of Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	2,722 18.7%	2,473 17.0%	3,047 19.0%	2,737 17.0%	2,996 18.3%	2,794 17.1%	2,947 18.6%	2,825 17.8%	2,959 18.7%	2,911 18.4%	2,942 18.5%	2,859 18.0%	2,591 19.1%	2,592 19.1%
f. # and % of Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards	Not Applicable													
Total # and Overall Participation Rate ¹⁷	14,334 98.6%	14,275 98.2%	15,887 98.9%	15,869 98.8%	16,155 98.9%	16,151 98.9%	15,670 98.9%	15,658 98.8%	15,639 98.7%	15,591 98.4%	15,621 98.5%	15,560 98.1%	12,587 92.6%	12,481 91.9%

Source: MDE/BAA

¹⁴ Participation data does not include Limited English Proficiency students who, at the time of testing, were in the United States for less than 10 months and participated in the ELPA in place of the regular reading assessment.

¹⁵ Students included in a, but not b-f above are the result of Michigan's enrollment data being gathered on 10/29/10 for fall assessments and 03/17/11 for spring assessments, with the assessment windows occurring from 10/11/10 - 11/19/10 (grades 3-8) and 2/14/11 - 3/25/11 (grade 11). In addition, Michigan does not count students with invalid scores as assessed.

¹⁶ The enrollment numbers differ slightly within a grade due to student mobility as Michigan assesses mathematics and reading during different weeks in the assessment window.

¹⁷ The bottom row represents the total numbers and rates of children with IEPs who participated in state assessment.

Table 3: B – Participation of Children with IEPs

Measurable and Rigorous Targets							
FFY	Reading						
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2005-2010 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2005 Actual	98.1%	98.6%	99.1%	97.0%	98.1%	97.5%	91.3%
2006 Actual	99.3%	99.7%	99.3%	99.3%	99.2%	98.9%	85.1%
2007 Actual	99.1%	98.8%	99.2%	99.7%	98.3%	98.3%	90.5%
2008 Actual	98.5%	98.5%	98.9%	98.5%	98.3%	97.6%	92.7%
2009 Actual	98.4%	98.5%	98.4%	98.2%	98.5%	97.5%	93.0%
2010 Actual	98.6%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.7%	98.5%	92.6%
2010 Status	Target met	Target not met					
Measurable and Rigorous Targets							
FFY	Mathematics						
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2005-2010 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2005 Actual	98.4%	98.9%	99.2%	97.5%	98.9%	98.1%	94.1%
2006 Actual	99.2%	99.6%	99.3%	99.1%	99.0%	98.8%	91.1%
2007 Actual	99.4%	99.1%	99.8%	98.7%	98.7%	98.8%	91.8%
2008 Actual	99.0%	98.9%	99.4%	99.1%	99.0%	98.4%	92.5%
2009 Actual	98.3%	98.5%	98.4%	98.1%	98.2%	97.0%	92.0%
2010 Actual	98.2%	98.8%	98.9%	98.8%	98.4%	98.1%	91.9%
2010 Status	Target met	Target not met					

Summary Information FFY 2010 Participation	
Students with IEPs Participating in State Reading Assessment	Students with IEPs Participating in State Mathematics Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of students with IEPs enrolled in tested grade levels = 108,101 • Number of students with IEPs participating = 105,893 • Percentage of students with IEPs participating = 98.0 percent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of students with IEPs enrolled in tested grade levels = 108,061 • Number of students with IEPs participating = 105,585 • Percentage of students with IEPs participating = 97.7 percent

Source: MDE/BAA

Table 4: C — Proficiency of children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards

Proficiency Rate	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8		Grade 11	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
a. Number of Children with IEPs in assessed grades	14,542	14,533	16,065	16,059	16,331	16,328	15,850	15,852	15,853	15,845	15,866	15,857	13,594	13,587
Total # of Participants ¹⁸	14,366	14,301	15,944	15,883	16,185	16,160	15,718	15,662	15,687	15,596	15,649	15,564	12,627	12,481
b. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations ¹⁹	6,105 42.5%	6,825 47.7%	5,679 35.6%	6,117 38.5%	5,393 33.3%	4,047 25.0%	4,949 31.5%	3,818 24.4%	3,678 23.4%	3,698 23.7%	4,312 27.6%	3,147 20.2%	787 6.2%	340 2.7%
c. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations	1,103 7.7%	3,648 25.5%	1,286 8.1%	4,054 25.5%	1,581 9.8%	2,652 16.4%	1,227 7.8%	3,125 20.0%	930 5.9%	2,825 18.1%	1,137 7.3%	2,381 15.3%	1,623 12.9%	791 6.3%
d. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
e. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards	2,064 14.4%	1,881 13.2%	2,279 14.3%	2,218 14.0%	2,287 14.1%	2,010 12.4%	2,441 15.5%	2,229 14.2%	2,564 16.3%	2,071 13.3%	2,557 16.3%	2,234 14.4%	2,182 17.3%	1,829 14.7%
f. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against modified achievement standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Total # and Overall Proficiency Rate for Children with IEPs	9,272 64.5%	12,354 86.4%	9,244 58.0%	12,389 78.0%	9,261 57.2%	8,709 53.9%	8,617 54.8%	9,172 58.6%	7,172 45.7%	8,594 55.1%	8,006 51.2%	7,762 49.9%	4,592 36.4%	2,960 23.7%

¹⁸ Michigan added this row and used it as the denominator when the “Total # and Overall Proficiency Rate for Children with IEPs” was calculated. The bottom row is based on the # of students with disabilities participating in the state regular or alternate assessments, not the total numbers of students with IEPs in a given grade. This was approved by the OSEP state contact and aligns with Michigan’s approved Accountability Workbook.

¹⁹ Students included in a, but not b-e above are the result of Michigan’s enrollment data being gathered on 10/29/10 for fall assessments and 03/17/11 for spring assessments, with the assessment windows occurring from 10/11/10 - 11/19/10 (grades 3-8) and 2/14/11 - 3/25/11 (grade 11). In addition, Michigan does not count students with invalid scores as assessed.

Source: MDE/BAA

Table 5: C – Proficiency of Children with IEPs

Measurable and Rigorous Targets - Reading							
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2005 Target	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	45.0%	43.0%	41.0%	52.0%
2005 Actual	53.3%	46.8%	45.0%	43.3%	38.4%	35.3%	25.1%
2006 Target	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	45.0%	43.0%	41.0%	52.0%
2006 Actual	56.1%	51.3%	49.0%	48.4%	43.2%	39.1%	25.5%
2007 Target	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	56.0%	54.0%	53.0%	61.0%
2007 Actual	57.9%	50.5%	48.9%	49.0%	42.1%	43.6%	24.5%
2008 Target	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	56.0%	54.0%	53.0%	61.0%
2008 Actual	60.0%	50.6%	48.8%	49.0%	48.8%	43.6%	28.0%
2009 Target	70.0%	69.0%	68.0%	67.0%	66.0%	65.0%	71.0%
2009 Actual	69.4%	60.0%	60.2%	62.8%	54.3%	55.4%	35.7%
2010 Target	78.0%	77.0%	76.0%	75.0%	74.0%	73.0%	79.0%
2010 Actual	64.5%	58.0%	57.2%	54.8%	45.7%	51.2%	36.4%
2010 Status	Target not met						
Measurable and Rigorous Targets – Mathematics							
	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
2005 Target	59.0%	56.0%	53.0%	50.0%	46.0%	43.0%	44.0%
2005 Actual	68.2%	59.0%	48.5%	35.3%	29.2%	31.9%	21.7%
2006 Target	59.0%	56.0%	53.0%	50.0%	46.0%	43.0%	44.0%
2006 Actual	74.1%	66.9%	50.9%	42.1%	35.2%	39.5%	22.1%
2007 Target	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2007 Actual	77.1%	67.7%	49.5%	42.9%	39.1%	40.4%	20.3%
2008 Target	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2008 Actual	79.3%	70.6%	51.5%	51.5%	50.6%	46.4%	22.1%
2009 Target	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2009 Actual	84.9%	80.0%	56.5%	56.2%	54.1%	39.5%	23.6%
2010 Target	75.0%	74.0%	71.0%	70.0%	67.0%	66.0%	67.0%
2010 Actual	86.4%	78.0%	53.9%	58.6%	55.1%	49.9%	23.7%
2010 Status	Target met	Target met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met

Source: MDE/BAA

The targets displayed in Tables 4 and 5 match those articulated in the *Michigan Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook* (Amended June 2010).

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 98.0 percent for districts meeting AYP objectives for the disability subgroup. Michigan met its FFY 2010 participation targets for students with IEPs in reading in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and also in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 in mathematics. Proficiency targets were met for grades 3 and 4 in mathematics. Proficiency targets were not met in reading in any grades.

Michigan saw a slight decrease in participation rates on statewide assessment for students with IEPs in grade 3 in mathematics and in grade 11 in both reading and mathematics.

Michigan's targets for proficiency are the same for all students including students with IEPs. Table 5 lists the grade level targets separately for reading and mathematics by year.

- Reading: FFY 2010 saw a marked increase in the State Board of Education established reading proficiency targets set for each grade. The targets increased by 8 percentage points from the FFY 2009 targets.
- Mathematics: FFY 2010 also saw a marked increase in the State Board of Education established mathematics proficiency targets set for each grade. The targets increased by 8-12 percentage points from the FFY 2009 targets.

Michigan demonstrated improvement in grade 11 in reading proficiency. Michigan demonstrated improvement in grades 3, 6, 7, 8 and 11 in mathematics proficiency, with notable gains in grade 8. Similar to last year Table 5 reveals that Michigan's students with IEPs did not meet the proficiency targets in any grades in reading or in grades 5-8 and 11 for mathematics.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2005-2011	1. Continue dissemination of information on the appropriate use of assessment accommodations, using conference sessions, joint presentations with accommodations/ assistive technology groups and newsletter articles.	The BAA disseminated accommodations information in the newly developed available at: www.michigan.gov/baa . In addition, the BAA developed an interactive accommodations table as part of the online version of the <i>Assessment Selection Guidance Manual</i> . Significant revisions were made to the <i>Decision-making Worksheet for Statewide Assessments</i> in order to include not only state assessment accommodations but also instructional accommodations. <i>The Assessment Selection Guidelines Manual</i> was presented at statewide and local conferences, to specific focus groups around the state, through <i>The BAA Assessment & Accountability Announcements</i> , through listserv messages and two Web casts for district coordinators and assessment administrators.
2005-2011	2. Determine the level of involvement with Michigan’s State Improvement Grant building level systems change model.	Michigan brought closure to this activity early in the 2010-2011 school year.
2005-2011	3. Collaborate with Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) to develop support systems and sustained implementation of a data-driven, problem-solving model.	According to American College Testing (ACT) College Readiness Standards, the largest predictors of postsecondary readiness are eighth grade reading scores. Middle schools receiving assistance from MiBLSi were provided professional development in literacy attainment, the adoption of positive behavior supports and fidelity of implementation contributing to a narrower reading gap and improved student outcomes. In 2010-2011, 85 middle schools participated in MiBLSi’s integrated behavior and reading project. MiBLSi altered its selection method to accept districts, rather than schools.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2008-2011	4. The BAA will make all the artwork used on its science and mathematics Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS) available for teachers to incorporate into instruction.	Michigan continues to update the mathematics, reading and science artwork used in MI-Access assessments posted to the Web page.
2009-2011	5. Develop and disseminate guidelines on selecting the appropriate assessment for students with disabilities.	Michigan has completed the <i>Assessment Selection Guidelines Manual</i> and is completing its work on the <i>Assessment Selection Guidelines</i> online learning program. <i>The Assessment Selection Guidelines Manual</i> was presented at statewide and local conferences, to specific focus groups around the state, through <i>The BAA Assessment & Accountability Announcements</i> , through listserv messages and two Web casts for district coordinators and assessment administrators.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2005-2011	6. Implement required elements of the <i>No Child Left Behind</i> accountability systems as outlined in the <i>Michigan Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook</i> , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership in the MDE workgroups • Continued support for improvements to the Michigan DRAFT Guidelines for Determining Participation in state Assessment for Students with Disabilities. 	<p>There was ongoing collaboration between the Office of Special Education (OSE) and BAA to recruit stakeholders for review committees and development teams.</p> <p>The OSE, BAA and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII) collaborated in the implementation of an OSEP General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) to develop a comprehensive model using existing general assessments to develop Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards (AA-MAS) and curricular and instructional supports. The Michigan Online Professional Learning System has modules that are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide schools and districts with a robust, research-based, job-embedded professional learning system • Assist and support instruction for

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>students in grades 2-8 who are struggling in mathematics and English language arts, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a strong connection to Career- and College-Readiness Standards to ensure that students are able to graduate with a high school diploma.
2009-2011	7. Systemically monitor students with disabilities' participation in state assessment, verify the student's IEP designates the state assessment, confirm the appropriate state assessment was given, verify the provision of accommodations, if specified in IEP and verify the assessment selected for English language learners with disabilities.	<p>The OSE expanded this monitoring project to include all intermediate school districts (ISDs) in the fall of 2010. Ten students with disabilities were selected within each ISD. Current IEPs were examined to confirm the appropriate state assessment was given and the student was provided with the appropriate accommodations. The BAA supported the OSE in the training of monitors for this task.</p>
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	8. As part of its efforts to ensure the appropriate participation of all students with disabilities in statewide assessment, Michigan has chosen to develop an AA-MAS. The MDE has received a GSEG from the USED to develop and implement the assessment, as well as a comprehensive online learning program designed to ensure appropriate student participation and support instruction.	<p>Michigan administered its AA-MAS known as MEAP-Access in fall 2009. Based on the results of that assessment, Michigan modified the item development process using research from other states with AA-MAS. Revised MEAP-Access items were embedded on the general assessment and alternate assessment (Functional Independence) in fall 2010. Data reviews were conducted and the results indicated the item revisions were successful. Michigan's AA-MAS will be operational again in fall 2011.</p>
2008-2011	9. Michigan will enhance its AA-AAS item writing procedures.	<p>New items for AA-AAS were written in FFY 2010 using the 4-phase item writing module that incorporated online item writer training from content specialists, required sample item submission and feedback which culminated in an item writing session on-site. Extended Depth of</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>Knowledge levels were assigned to all new items. All items will continue to be written by Michigan educators.</p> <p>Michigan is in the process of developing an Item Bank System that will house all state assessment items, allow for construction of blueprints and test maps within the item bank and will have an online item writing component.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	10. Participate with the Office of School Improvement, Field Services Unit teams to provide targeted technical assistance to high priority schools. ²⁰	The OSE collaborated with the OEII by participating in the Michigan Continuous School Improvement team meetings and training sessions offered to Title I schools, including the high priority schools.
2009-2011	11. Develop and disseminate tools to assist districts in using standards-based IEPs.	The new state model IEP form was implemented and all companion Quick Guides were developed and distributed.
EVALUATION		
2007-2011	12. The MDE, as part of a state consortium, has been awarded a three-year GSEG from the U.S. Department of Education to study the consequential validity of AA-AAS. Michigan, along with Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) will conduct a nine-year longitudinal study to gather consequential evidence.	In coordination with the NCRRC, the MDE participated in a validity study to review the alignment of the AA-AAS with instruction. Building on the annual survey that began in the fall of 2009, the MDE organized a focus group of teachers of students with disabilities to gather in-depth qualitative data from assessment administrators of the AA-AAS. This focus group was held in April 2011, with two additional follow-up focus groups held later in the year. This provided valuable curricular and instructional data for Michigan's stakeholders who serve students with disabilities participating in the AA-AAS.
2008–2011	13. The National Alternate Assessment Center has recently completed a	Michigan continued to conduct an inventory of the AA-AAS item bank to determine if all state assessable content

²⁰ Schools in School Improvement Phase 1 or higher

Timelines	Activities	Status
	<p>comprehensive alignment study of all three of Michigan’s AA-AAS. As a result, Michigan now has a significant amount of data indicating the alignment between these AA-AAS and state content standards. Michigan will review this data and make needed revisions to the assessment design or items necessary to ensure that state content standards are being appropriately measured for each student population assessed by Michigan’s three AA-AAS in the content areas of English language arts, mathematics and science.</p>	<p>standards had high quality items written to assess the state content standards. Michigan used the results of the item bank inventory to develop new items. Content Advisory Committees reviewed all new items to ensure alignment between state content standards and new items.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status							OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response																																																															
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 99.4%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 97%.</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.</p>																																																															
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Target</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.0%</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.4%</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>98.2%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>98.1%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>99.0%</td> <td>98.2%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>97.6%</td> <td>97.5%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>97.0%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>92.7%</td> <td>93.0%</td> <td>95%</td> <td>92.5%</td> <td>92.0%</td> <td>95%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>									Grade	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target		Reading			Math			3	98.5%	98.4%	95%	99.0%	98.3%	95%	4	98.5%	98.5%	95%	98.9%	98.5%	95%	5	98.9%	98.4%	95%	99.4%	98.4%	95%	6	98.5%	98.2%	95%	99.1%	98.1%	95%	7	98.3%	98.5%	95%	99.0%	98.2%	95%	8	97.6%	97.5%	95%	98.4%	97.0%	95%	HS	92.7%	93.0%	95%	92.5%	92.0%	95%
Grade	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target																																																																	
	Reading			Math																																																																			
3	98.5%	98.4%	95%	99.0%	98.3%	95%																																																																	
4	98.5%	98.5%	95%	98.9%	98.5%	95%																																																																	
5	98.9%	98.4%	95%	99.4%	98.4%	95%																																																																	
6	98.5%	98.2%	95%	99.1%	98.1%	95%																																																																	
7	98.3%	98.5%	95%	99.0%	98.2%	95%																																																																	
8	97.6%	97.5%	95%	98.4%	97.0%	95%																																																																	
HS	92.7%	93.0%	95%	92.5%	92.0%	95%																																																																	

Indicator Status							OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response																																																															
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Target</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>60.0%</td> <td>69.4%</td> <td>70.0%</td> <td>79.3%</td> <td>84.9%</td> <td>67.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>60.0%</td> <td>69.0%</td> <td>70.6%</td> <td>80.0%</td> <td>65.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>48.8%</td> <td>60.2%</td> <td>68.0%</td> <td>51.5%</td> <td>56.5%</td> <td>62.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>49.0%</td> <td>62.8%</td> <td>67.0%</td> <td>51.5%</td> <td>56.2%</td> <td>60.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>48.8%</td> <td>54.3%</td> <td>66.0%</td> <td>50.6%</td> <td>54.1%</td> <td>57.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>43.6%</td> <td>55.4%</td> <td>65.0%</td> <td>46.4%</td> <td>39.5%</td> <td>54.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>28.0%</td> <td>35.7%</td> <td>71.0%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>23.6%</td> <td>55.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							Grade	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target		Reading			Math			3	60.0%	69.4%	70.0%	79.3%	84.9%	67.0%	4	50.6%	60.0%	69.0%	70.6%	80.0%	65.0%	5	48.8%	60.2%	68.0%	51.5%	56.5%	62.0%	6	49.0%	62.8%	67.0%	51.5%	56.2%	60.0%	7	48.8%	54.3%	66.0%	50.6%	54.1%	57.0%	8	43.6%	55.4%	65.0%	46.4%	39.5%	54.0%	HS	28.0%	35.7%	71.0%	22.1%	23.6%	55.0%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.</p>
Grade	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target																																																																	
	Reading			Math																																																																			
3	60.0%	69.4%	70.0%	79.3%	84.9%	67.0%																																																																	
4	50.6%	60.0%	69.0%	70.6%	80.0%	65.0%																																																																	
5	48.8%	60.2%	68.0%	51.5%	56.5%	62.0%																																																																	
6	49.0%	62.8%	67.0%	51.5%	56.2%	60.0%																																																																	
7	48.8%	54.3%	66.0%	50.6%	54.1%	57.0%																																																																	
8	43.6%	55.4%	65.0%	46.4%	39.5%	54.0%																																																																	
HS	28.0%	35.7%	71.0%	22.1%	23.6%	55.0%																																																																	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 4A (Suspension/Expulsion) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In March 2009, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) instituted a one-year data lag for this indicator so that the required monitoring elements could be completed prior to report submission. Therefore, 2009-2010 data are reported in this FFY 2010 APR.
3. During the 2009-2010 school year Michigan required all districts to report suspension and expulsion data for students with disabilities in the state's Michigan Student Data System (MSDS). The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) maintains this data system. Significant discrepancy was calculated using only data on students with individualized education programs (IEPs) since comparable data are not available for the general school population.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²¹/Suspension/Expulsion

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

A district was identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and/or expulsions if more than five percent of its students with IEPs received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than ten days cumulatively during the school year. Districts that met the five percent threshold, but had fewer than five students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than ten days, were exempt from consideration as having a significant discrepancy.

²¹ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Calculations Using Previous Definition of Significant Discrepancy			
2005	1.2%		
2006		< 10.0%	1.5%
2007		< 9.0%	1.4%
OSEP Prescribed a One Year Data Lag for This Indicator			
2008 (2007-2008 data)		< 9.0%	1.4%
Calculations Using Current Definition of Significant Discrepancy			
2009 (2008-2009 data)	5.1%	< 5.5%	5.1%
2010 (2009-2010 data)		< 5.0%	2.8%*
Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100.			
*[23 ÷ 829] X 100			

Sources: MSDS, verification review

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan met its FFY 2010 target of < 5.0 percent for Indicator 4A. During the 2009-2010 school year, 2.8 percent of the districts in the state that met the minimum “n” size had more than 5 percent of their students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than ten days cumulatively. Twelve districts were excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation because they had fewer than five students with IEPs suspended/expelled for greater than ten days.

Through monitoring and technical assistance (TA) the state has increased efforts to ensure identified districts are compliant with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA).

Efforts emphasizing alternatives to suspension using positive behavioral interventions and supports, the use of suspension/expulsion tracking systems and the sharing of discipline data among local staff members have been effective in addressing discipline issues.

Focused monitoring activities also addressed data submission issues. The Office of Special Education’s (OSE) continuing communication efforts described in the APR Overview, along with intermediate school districts’ (ISDs) efforts to assist their local districts with timely and accurate data submissions, resulted in a more accurate picture of the rates of suspensions/expulsions.

In addition, Michigan examined data validity, reliability and timeliness of several data submissions when making district determinations. Focusing on these elements has enhanced districts’ attention to the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of their discipline data submissions.

Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices

Thirteen of the twenty-three districts were newly identified for focused monitoring activities based on the focused monitoring selection criteria. During February and March 2011, the OSE conducted ten focused monitoring on-site reviews and three state verified desk audits of these districts’ policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA. Twelve of the thirteen districts with focused monitoring activities were found to have inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices, were issued findings of noncompliance and were required to submit and implement a corrective action plan.

Ten of the twenty-three districts had been previously focused monitored. Of those ten, eight had findings of noncompliance, and two had no findings. For the eight districts with findings, noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner. Upon notification, these districts were required to submit and implement a corrective action plan to come into compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification. Through on-site visits, changes to the policies, procedures and practices were verified, and the districts were found to be correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2006-2011	1. Continue the review of suspension/expulsion data and report progress toward meeting targets in the APR.	The OSE continued to collect and analyze suspension/expulsion data. The data reported here are a summary of the CEPI’s analysis of the verified data.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2008-2011	2. Collaborate with Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to	The OSE provided MiBLSi a list of districts with high suspension/expulsion rates. These districts were then given priority for participation in MiBLSi. Eight

Timelines	Activities	Status
	continue to reduce the rate of suspensions/expulsions in the state.	of the districts identified based on 2009-2010 data have schools that are participating in MiBLSi, and two districts have applied for district participation.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	3. Provide Technical Assistance in response to major patterns of focused monitoring findings for example; create a webinar based on the <i>OSE Discipline Procedures</i> .	Based on feedback from ISD and local educational agency (LEA) special education directors, many presentations and learning opportunities were provided based on the patterns of focused monitoring findings for discipline. Public comment was used to revise the <i>OSE Discipline Procedures</i> to better meet districts' needs. In lieu of a webinar, both small and large group presentations were provided.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	35
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	34
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	1

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	0

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

FFY 2009 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
1	4A/B	1	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding issued: May 15, 2010 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a corrective action plan based on a root cause analysis and submission of a progress report. State supervision and TA providers were assigned. The status of the correction of this noncompliance was included in monthly meetings and conference calls.</p> <p>Status: Verified as corrected by TA providers and closed by the OSE on June 30, 2011.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided a revised FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are 5.1%. The State changed its method for determining what constitutes a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. Therefore, OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2009 revised target of <5.5%. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 821 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of more than five students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than ten days, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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) for 39 of the 42 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State:</p> <p>(1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008</p>	<p>Noncompliance that the state identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review conducted was corrected in 34 districts within one year of notification. One district was corrected beyond one year.</p> <p>This correction of noncompliance was verified and each LEA with noncompliance was identified by the state:</p> <p>(1) correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a state data system; and (2) corrected each individual</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) in the prior year, the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected.</p>	<p>(OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.</p> <p>Noncompliance in the two districts identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected. Each district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). Revision of the improvement activities is not necessary at this time.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 4B (Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity)
Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Indicator 4B is a compliance indicator with a target of zero percent.
3. In fall 2011 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) provided guidance regarding acceptable methodologies for determining significant discrepancy. Michigan was notified that its previous methodology using risk ratios was not acceptable and required revision. A new methodology was applied to the 2009-2010 data as required and is described later in this document.
4. The OSEP also required these data be used as a new baseline.
5. Districts identified as having a significant discrepancy participated in monitoring activities per the monitoring selection criteria.

Monitoring Priority: Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 4B:

Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with individualized education programs (IEPs); and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state times 100)].

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

For this indicator, Michigan defined "significant discrepancy" as a suspension/expulsion rate greater than or equal to 3.6 percent for students with IEPs in any racial/ethnic group within a district. In 2009-2010 1.8 percent of students with IEPs were suspended/expelled for greater than ten days and that number was doubled to create the 3.6 percent threshold for calculating significant discrepancy. In order for a district to be included in the analyses, there needed to be at least 30 students

with IEPs enrolled in the district. For these selected districts the data were analyzed for each race/ethnicity with ten or more students with IEPs enrolled in the district.

There were 117 districts that had fewer than 30 students with IEPs and were not included in further analyses. Michigan does not collect universal suspension/expulsion data on general education students; therefore a comparison with that population is not possible.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Old Methodology Using Risk Ratio			
2009 (2008-2009 data)	6.5%	0%	6.5%
Using New Acceptable Methodology per OSEP			
2010 (2009-2010 data)	3.3%	0%	3.3%*
Percent = [(#of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state times 100)]. *[27 ÷ 829] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), verification review, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet the FFY 2010 zero percent target for Indicator 4B using the FFY 2009 data as required. During the 2009-2010 school year, 3.3 percent of districts with students with IEPs were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days in at least one racial/ethnic group and after review, were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Due to the OSEP required change in methodology, a new baseline was established and does not allow comparison with previous baseline. The OSEP required change in methodology resulted in additional districts being identified for a monitoring activity.

Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices

For FFY 2010 reporting based on FFY 2009 data, 131 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rates of suspension and expulsion prior to monitoring. During February, March and November 2011, based on the focused monitoring criteria, the Office of Special Education (OSE) conducted on-site reviews, desk audits and state verified self-reviews of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA).

After monitoring, 27 districts were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Each of these districts was issued a finding of noncompliance in April or December 2011 and was required to develop and implement a corrective action plan (CAP) to come into compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification. Displayed in the table below is the number of districts with findings of noncompliance by the racial/ethnic group(s) which had a significant discrepancy.

Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy	Number of Districts²² With Significant Discrepancy
American Indian	1
Black	18
Hispanic	5
White	11

Sources: MSDS, verification review, monitoring data from the CIMS

Districts previously monitored and identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy were implementing a CAP to come into compliance within one year including verification. These districts received notice through the CIMS electronic workbook informing them of the continuing discrepant data and the need to continue to implement the activities of the CAP. These districts continued to receive technical assistance (TA).

²² Seven districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2010-2011	1. Provide tools for districts to access and review their racial/ethnic patterns of discipline data.	The MSDS discipline reports provided student level discipline information including race/ethnicity and allowed analysis of patterns.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2010-2011	2. Collaborate with Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to reduce the rate of disproportionate suspensions/expulsions in the state.	Districts with high suspension/expulsion rates that applied to MiBLSi were given priority. Twenty-six districts identified based on 2009-2010 discipline data had schools participating in MiBLSi.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	3. Provide TA providers with consistent guidance in response to patterns of focused monitoring findings.	Patterns of findings related to discipline were addressed through trainings, monthly conference calls, a revised <i>Discipline Procedures</i> , and new procedural documents for TA providers.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	76
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational agency of the finding)	75
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	1

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	1
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	0

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

FFY 2009 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
1	4A/B	1	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding issued: May 15, 2010 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of a progress report. State supervision and TA providers were assigned. The status of the correction of this noncompliance was included in monthly meetings and conference calls.</p> <p>Status: Verified as corrected by TA providers and closed by the OSE on June 30, 2011.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 6.5%. The State reported that 67 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that 53 districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State reported that 22 of 821 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of having more than five students suspended/expelled for greater than ten days, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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) for</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were</p>	<p>The districts with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance and Michigan has verified the district: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements(s) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of data through on-site monitoring or a state data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02. Verification of the correction was completed through the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of new student records 2. Staff interviews to confirm knowledge of new procedures 3. A review of

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data.</p>	<p>taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>	<p>new written policies/ procedures</p> <p>4. A review of documentation of completed activities detailed in the CAP</p> <p>As described in the Overview, the OSEP did require Michigan to change its methodology. The data submitted in this APR reflects methodology included in the OSEP/Data Accountability Center samples of acceptable methodology.</p> <p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will result in the state becoming compliant.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 5 (Educational Environments) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education (OSE) has prioritized focused monitoring activities for educational environments for districts that have low percentages of students with individualized education programs (IEPs) inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day.
3. In 2010, the OSEP approved a Michigan change in the Special Education Child Count data from December 1 to the third Wednesday in November.
4. In 2010 the data collection also changed from a separate special education data system to the universal Michigan Student Data System (MSDS).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²³ / Educational Environments

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

²³ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
A. Increase the percentage of students served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	54.0%		
2006		≥ 55.0%	50.3%
2007		≥ 57.0%	53.5%
2008		≥ 59.0%	57.6%
2009		≥ 61.0%	61.1%
2010		≥ 63.0%	61.6%*
Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.			
*[120,692 ÷ 195,774] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
B. Decrease the percentage of students served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	17.9%		
2006		≤ 16.9%	18.5%
2007		≤ 15.4%	16.8%
2008		≤ 13.9%	15.0%
2009		≤ 12.4%	14.0%
2010		≤ 11.9%	12.5%*
Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.			
*[24,456 ÷ 195,774] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
C. Decrease the percentage of students served in separate facilities			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	5.2%		
2006		≤ 5.1%	5.0%
2007		≤ 5.1%	4.8%
2008		≤ 5.0%	4.9%
2009		≤ 4.9%	4.9%
2010		≤ 4.8%	5.2% *
Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. *[10,147 ÷ 195,774] X 100			

Source for A-C: MSDS

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for Indicator 5. However, it continued to make progress in the desired directions in Target A and B. Target C shows slippage in the percentage of students served in separate facilities. Data from FFY 2006 through FFY 2010 were examined. The number of students with IEPs in separate facilities has remained relatively stable, at about 10,000. In contrast, the total number of students with IEPs ages 6-21 has declined from 215,456 to 195,774, a decrease of 19,682 students, or 9.1 percent.

Focused Monitoring Activities

Thirteen districts participated in on-site focused monitoring for educational environments during FFY 2010. The districts were selected based on their low percentages of students with IEPs in general education for 80 percent or more of the day (Target A). Eleven of those districts had findings related to educational environments. For eight of the districts with findings, data reporting errors were a factor in the noncompliance.

Districts that did not meet all three targets for FFY 2009 were required through the April 2011 *Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook* to convene a team to review and analyze their data as well as the underlying issues, strategies for improvement and methods for monitoring progress. The teams were then required to prepare a report for their district school improvement team. A review of those reports indicated that there were a number of factors involved:

- Data reporting errors.
- Districts operating regional center programs or regional separate facilities as a part of a consortium for students with more severe impairments. Students

from other districts placed into these programs were included in the operating district's educational environments data.

- Small districts with small numbers of students with IEPs. The movement in or out of the district of one or two students changed percentages significantly.
- Districts using a traditional pull-out model of service delivery.
- Budget reductions reducing or eliminating co-teaching opportunities.
- Scheduling issues at middle schools and high schools, including trimesters and block scheduling.
- The more rigorous graduation requirements of the Michigan Merit Curriculum affecting the class of 2011 and beyond resulting in more intensive programming.
- Lack of professional development for staff.

Many districts reported that their implementation of a Response to Intervention (RtI) process has resulted in increased use of data for decision-making in many areas, including IEP placement decisions and how to support students with IEPs in general education classes. These districts reported that this has resulted in increased numbers of students with IEPs in general education classes 80 percent or more of the time.

Districts that identified data reporting errors, lack of professional development, traditional pull-out programming, scheduling issues and budget constraints as factors in missing targets, developed improvement plans to address these concerns. Several of these districts have already implemented their plans, and have reported improvements in their educational environments data for FFY 2010.

Changing Practices

More districts report moving away from the traditional pull-out model of service delivery as a result of reviewing their educational environments data as a part of the CIMS process. Many districts use team teaching and co-teaching models, as well as differentiated instruction to support students with IEPs and other at-risk students in general education settings. The widespread adoption of RtI approaches, including Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi), has increased data-based decision-making for instruction.

Data Reporting

Technical assistance from the OSE has continued to help districts improve accuracy in Educational Environments data reporting. In addition, the emphasis on using data for decision-making supported through the CIMS process continued to provide an impetus for districts to improve their data systems through upgrading software and staff training. Accurate data reporting continued to be an area requiring sustained focus for districts and the OSE.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	1. Prioritize targeted districts to receive technical assistance (TA) from MiBLSi, a RtI initiative which provides training and supports for school wide Positive Behavior Support and literacy achievement.	<p>During FFY 2010, MiBLSi continued to scale up its presence into 477 elementary schools, 85 middle schools and 15 high schools within Michigan. This represents MiBLSi activity in 43 of the 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs) within the state.</p> <p>The OSE provided MiBLSi with a list of 12 districts with low rates of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day. Eight of the 12 districts have one or more schools participating in MiBLSi. These 12 districts were given priority for any schools not yet participating.</p>
2008-2011	2. Implement standards-based IEP policies and procedures to increase the ties between IEP development and the general education curriculum.	Standards-based IEP policies and procedures have been incorporated into the new state model IEP form and process to link explicitly to the general curriculum.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2011	3. Verify and analyze educational environment data for the set of districts whose percentage of students with disabilities in general education 80 percent or more of the day are furthest below the state target. Assist districts in reviewing policies and procedures related to environments data and require them, as needed, to develop and implement improvement plans.	The OSE used site visits to monitor 13 districts' policies, procedures and practices related to educational environment data. Noncompliance was found in 11 of these districts. Upon notification of findings, these districts were required to develop and implement corrective action plans to come into compliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year including verification.
2008-2011	4. Districts which fail to correct instances of noncompliance within one year will be required to revise their corrective action plans to achieve compliance. The	During the FFY 2010, one district failed to correct noncompliance within one year of notification. This district revised its corrective action plan and received increased state

Timelines	Activities	Status
	<p>districts will receive increased OSE on-site TA including close supervision of the implementation of the revised corrective action plan.</p>	<p>supervision to come into compliance. Twenty percent of all <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> funds that were requested were held until the activities outlined in the corrective action plan were completed and proof of compliance provided. The district came into compliance in FFY 2010.</p>
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
<p>2007-2011</p>	<p>5. The OSE State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator leads analyze how educational environments impact other indicators, particularly disproportionate representation and postsecondary outcomes. Indicator leads will do cross-cutting work among educational environments, disproportionate representation and postsecondary outcomes.</p>	<p>Cross-cutting work continued to examine how educational environments impact disproportionate representation and postsecondary outcomes.</p>
<p>2008-2011</p>	<p>6. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FAPE in the LRE SPP indicators • Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant • Michigan’s emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	<p>Through use of the CIMS, the OSE has been implementing an integrated set of activities by aligning data collection, analysis, focused monitoring, reporting and corrective action activities across indicators. Findings of noncompliance specific to Indicator 5 were issued through the <i>CIMS Workbook</i>. For additional information, see Explanation of Progress or Slippage section.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
<p>2006-2011</p>	<p>7. Provide TA to districts to assist them with issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding how to report educational environment data accurately. This activity will concentrate on defining what constitutes time in special education environment and time in regular education. 	<p>In FFY 2010 the state made the transition from a separate special education data system into the Michigan Student Data System which is the unified data collection system for all students.</p> <p>The Center for Educational Performance and Information</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helping data entry staff in local educational agencies and ISDs to improve the accuracy and consistency of student data reporting. Emphasize accuracy of data reported for separate facilities. 	(CEPI), the Michigan Compliance Information System and the OSE provided TA to districts through conference calls, the CEPI Help Desk, workshops, ISD Director meetings, individualized assistance by phone or email and memoranda highlighting correct procedures for common data reporting errors and the differences in the upcoming data reporting protocol. General education pupil accounting personnel became involved during FFY 2009 in preparation for the system transition.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response																				
<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="181 1314 1000 1755"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Data</th> <th>FFY 2009 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>57.6</td> <td>61.1</td> <td>> 61.0</td> <td>3.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>15.0</td> <td>14.0</td> <td>< 12.4</td> <td>-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>4.9</td> <td>4.9</td> <td>< 4.9</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target for 5A but did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for 5B and 5C.</p>		FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57.6	61.1	> 61.0	3.50%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.0	14.0	< 12.4	-1.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.9	4.9	< 4.9	0.00%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.</p>
	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	57.6	61.1	> 61.0	3.50%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.0	14.0	< 12.4	-1.00%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.9	4.9	< 4.9	0.00%																		

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 6 (Preschool Educational Environments) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Per The Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP's) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and APR Instruction Sheet:

"States are not required to report on Indicator 6 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012".

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²⁴/Preschool Educational Environments
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with individualized education programs (IEPs) attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.	None required.

²⁴ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 7 (Preschool Outcomes) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Targets were established by an examination of trend data and through advisory committee input.
3. From 2005 through 2010, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Part B Preschool Outcomes were collected on Scantron forms and processed. This year, data collection transitioned to the web-based Michigan Student Data System (MSDS).
4. Summary statements are included in this report and in local level reports. Summary statements were devised by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center in order to reduce data burden for early childhood outcomes.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²⁵ / Preschool Outcomes

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with individualized education programs (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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$

²⁵ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d)}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d)})] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (e)}) \div (\text{the total } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)})] \times 100$.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome A: Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	86.8%		
2009		86.0%	85.5%
2010		87.0%	81.1%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.			
*[(744+979) ÷ (88+314+744+979)] x 100			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	60.7%		
2009		60.0%	59.8%
2010		61.0%	56.5%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.			
*[(979+512) ÷ (88+314+744+979+512)] x 100			

Sources: MSDS, HighScope

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome B: Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	86.5%		
2009		86.0%	86.8%
2010		87.0%	82.2%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.			
*[(744+1099) ÷ (76+324+744+1099)] × 100			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	58.0%		
2009		58.0%	58.2%
2010		59.0%	56.6%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.			
*[(1099+394) ÷ (76+324+744+1099+394)] × 100			

Sources: MSDS, HighScope

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome C: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	88.2%		
2009		88.0%	87.7%
2010		89.0%	80.6%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.			
*[(594+1057) ÷ (95+303+594+1057)] x 100			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	72.3%		
2009		72.0%	71.6%
2010		73.0%	62.5%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.			
*[(1057+595) ÷ (95+303+594+1057+595)] x 100			

Sources: MSDS, HighScope

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for any of the six summary statements for Indicator 7. In order to improve long-term data quality and program improvement, data were collected through the MSDS for the first time during the 2010-2011 school year. From 2005 through 2010, data were collected on Scantron forms and processed. While data changes were forecasted during the transition of data systems, a variety of other factors led to slippage for FFY 2010.

In order to explain why FFY 2010 performance was lower than FFY 2009, the Michigan Department of Education examined whether there were changes in children’s characteristics between the two reporting years. Eligibility categories reported shifted between FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.

Eligibility Category at Program Exit

Eligibility Category	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
Autism Spectrum Disorder	7.3%	7.2%
Cognitive Impairment	2.9%	3.6%
Deaf/Blindness	0.0%	0.1%
Early Childhood Developmental Delay	18.1%	19.9%
Emotional Impairment	0.5%	0.2%
Hearing Impairment	0.8%	0.8%
Other Health Impairment	3.2%	4.0%
Physical Impairment	1.6%	1.8%
Severe Multiple Impairment	0.9%	1.7%
Specific Learning Disability	1.0%	0.1%
Speech and Language Impairment	64.1%	60.4%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.2%	0.1%
Visual Impairment	0.4%	0.1%
Multiple special needs	1.0%	0.0%

Sources: MSDS, HighScope

Analysis of three years of data indicates that children with speech and language impairment as a primary eligibility category were more likely to progress to or maintain at the age appropriate level in the three outcome areas, compared to children with other disabilities. Children with cognitive impairments or multiple special needs were less likely to be functioning at a level equal to typically developing peers at program exit. Data in this table reveal a change in the needs of children served in Early Childhood Special Education programs. Fewer children with speech and language impairments were served in FFY 2010 while there was an increase in the percentage of children in six of the categories (note bolded numbers in the table).

The transition of data collection protocol to MSDS was intended to improve data consistency, reduce errors and track and match individual child-level data. This system will improve the collection of data and student outcomes. Districts established and/or refined protocols for data entry and personnel required training. As a result, fewer assessment records were submitted and fewer entry/exit match results were reported.

The records received in 2010-2011 were 36 percent less than were received in 2009-2010. The Office of Early Childhood Education & Family Services (ECE&FS), in collaboration with the Office of Special Education, provided technical assistance (TA) and support.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2009-2011	1. Re-assess progress, activities and resources needed.	The Office of ECE&FS coordinated two subgrants to address TA and professional development (PD), and data analysis and reporting. When assessing activities and resources, it was determined that multiple resources and reference guides were needed to meet the increasing demands of the Office of Early Childhood Special Education programs. The Office of ECE&FS, with its TA grantee, continuously developed and assessed online training materials and webinars. Increased assessment of activities and resources resulted in greater commitment from local district providers.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2009-2011	2. Develop and implement training and targeted TA for service areas not meeting proposed targets.	Data reports for preschool outcomes were developed for all local districts. These districts received detailed reports, including data disaggregated by outcome area, category and scores. Districts were notified if they did not meet proposed targets. Targeted TA was available to those districts as well as regional PD opportunities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status				OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>Progress data and actual target data are presented on previous pages.</p>
Summary Statement 1	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.8	85.5	86.0		
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	86.5	86.8	86.0		
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.2	87.7	88.0		
Summary Statement 2	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2009 Target		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	60.7	59.8	60.0		
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	58.0	58.2	58.0		
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72.3	71.6	72.0		

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 8 (Facilitated Parent Involvement) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Statewide surveys were mailed to all parents of children ages 3 through 5 years who received special education services and one-third of all parents of students ages 6 through 21 years who received special education services.
3. Both surveys were developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and were available in English, Spanish and Arabic. Families also were given the option to complete the survey online or via a telephone interview using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing technology.
4. With the exception of racial/ethnic composition, the survey responses comparing the child characteristics to the special education population were representative. Additional analyses of the racial/ethnic responses determined that the differences were not statistically significant.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²⁶/Facilitated Parent Involvement
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

²⁶ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Measurable and Rigorous Targets Children ages 3-5 years			
FFY	Baseline²⁷	Target	Actual
2007	34.0%		
2008		34.5%	36.8%
2009		35.0%	47.8%
2010		35.5%	*58.7%
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.			
*[3,866 ÷ 6,586] X 100			

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey

Measurable and Rigorous Targets Students ages 6-21 years			
FFY	Baseline²⁸	Target	Actual
2007	20.5%		
2008		21.0%	25.1%
2009		21.5%	26.2%
2010		22.0%	*25.9%
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.			
*[3,938 ÷ 15,222] X 100			

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan met both its FFY 2010 target for children ages 3 through 5 years (35.5 percent) and its target for students ages 6 through 21 years (22.0 percent) for Indicator 8.

Compared to the FFY 2009 Part B parent surveys, the percent of parents of children ages 3 through 5 years at or above the standard in FFY 2010 was higher (58.7 percent versus 47.8 percent). The percent of parent surveys for students ages 6 through 21 years at or above the standard was about the same in FFY 2010 as the previous year (25.9 percent versus 26.2 percent).

²⁷ New baseline per revised State Performance Plan (SPP)

²⁸ New baseline per revised SPP

There is insufficient information to attribute the increase in the children ages 3 through 5 years sample to specific activities at this time.

Discussion of FFY 2010 Data

Survey Instrument

There were two versions of the survey for parents of children receiving special education services:

- One for parents of children ages 3 through 5.
- One for parents of students ages 6 to 21.

The parent survey for children ages 3 through 5 years contained 37 NCSEAM items measuring “Efforts to Partner with Parents”, while the parent survey for students ages 6 through 21 included 25 items measuring this same construct. The survey for children ages 3 through 5 years also contained an additional 13 NCSEAM items measuring “Quality of Services” for a total of 50 items.

Sampling

Surveys were disseminated to all parents of children ages 3 through 5 years who received special education services and one-third of all parents of students ages 6 through 21 years who received special education services.²⁹

- Parents of students ages 6 through 21 years were selected to participate in the survey using an Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) approved cohort sampling plan.
- Approximately one-third of local school districts within every intermediate school district were selected to participate in the survey for students ages 6 through 21 years. The exception is the one district with a student population greater than 50,000 that participates on an annual basis.

Response Rates

There were 6,586 respondents of the children ages 3 through 5 years survey (32.3 percent response rate) and 15,222 of the students ages 6 through 21 years survey (25.4 percent response rate), for a total number of 21,808 responses (27.2 percent total response rate).

Representativeness of the Sample

Comparisons of child characteristics between the statewide population and respondent sample revealed that the responses are representative of the entire Michigan Part B special education population with the exception of the proportion of children ages 3 through 5 years and students ages 6 through 21 years and racial/ethnic composition.

Because of the sampling procedure used, the ratio of survey respondents with children ages 3 through 5 years to respondents with students ages 6 through 21 years is greater than the ratio found in the state. However, because results are

²⁹ In households with more than one child receiving special education services, one child was selected at random and parents were asked to respond to the survey based on their experiences with that child.

presented for each sample separately, there is no need to apply weights³⁰ to each sample in order to adjust these proportions.

**FFY 2010 Parent Survey Respondents' Child Race/Ethnicity³¹
Compared to the State**

	3-5 Years Sample	3-5 Years Statewide Population	6-21 Years Sample	6-21 Years Cohort 1 Population
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.9% (n=59)	1.1% (n=243)	0.9% (n=141)	1.0% (n=707)
Asian	2.1% (n=137)*	1.7% (n=393)	1.0% (n=155)*	0.8% (n=596)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.1% (n=6)	0.1% (n=19)	0.1% (n=21)	0.1% (n=72)
Black or African American	10.6% (n=696)*	13.9% (n=3,130)	21.1% (n=3,213)*	26.8% (n=19,319)
Hispanic/Latino	6.0% (n=397)*	6.4% (n=1,435)	4.3% (n=654)*	5.7% (n=4,143)
White	78.6% (n=5,174)*	74.7% (n=16,837)	71.4% (n=10,874)*	64.5% (n=46,464)
Two or More Races	1.8% (n=117)	2.1% (n=471)	1.1% (n=164)	1.1% (n=789)

* Difference between sample and statewide is statistically significant.

The table above summarizes respondents' children's race/ethnicity in comparison to statewide demographics. To determine if the difference in racial/ethnic distribution made a significant impact on the findings related to this indicator, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each racial/ethnic group. Weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each group in the Part B population by the corresponding proportion in the sample.

A comparison of the unweighted results and results after weighting by race/ethnicity showed no statistically significant difference in the scores (see table below). Therefore, even though the sample was not representative in terms of race/ethnicity, the results were not statistically significant.

³⁰ Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population.

³¹ Note that, in accordance with federal guidelines, the survey for FFY 2010 introduced a new survey item to determine the ethnicity of respondents. The item asks respondents to indicate whether they are of Hispanic or non-Hispanic descent; this supplements the race item, which, unlike in previous years, now allows respondents to select multiple racial categories.

Indicator 8 Results Before and After Weighting for Race/Ethnicity

	Unweighted		Weighted by Race/Ethnicity	
	n	% at or above standard	n	% at or above standard
Children Ages 3-5 Years Sample	6,586	58.7%	6,573	58.4%
Students Ages 6-21 Years Sample	15,222	25.9%	15,188	25.6%
	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation
Children Ages 3-5 Years Sample	653	146.0	652	145.9
Students Ages 6-21 Years Sample	532	131.1	531	131.7

Additional details regarding the sampling and weighting procedures are available in the SPP Extension on the OSE website.

Results

A final score was derived from responses to all the items in the “Efforts to Partner with Parents” scale.³² Scores ranged from 169 to 836, for the children ages 3 through 5 years sample and from 169 to 903 for the students ages 6 through 21 years sample. Michigan’s parents’ surveys yielded an overall average of 653 for ages 3 through 5 and 532 for ages 6 through 21.

Through stakeholder input garnered from focus groups, the NCSEAM set a national standard score of 600. According to the NCSEAM, “The standard is not about agreement with a single item. Given the consistent pattern in families’ responses to the items, a high likelihood of agreement with the threshold item implies the same or greater likelihood of agreement with items located ‘below’ this one on the scale.”³³ The percentage of parent survey scores of 600 or higher is used to measure this indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	1. Wayne State University (WSU) will continue the annual administration of the parent survey data. The results of the parent surveys will be used for the APR and the CIMS Review and Analysis Process.	The parent survey results continued to be used for the APR and the CIMS. FFY 2009 parent survey results were reported in the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> .

³² From the Avatar International, Inc. report, “Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Special Education Parent Survey Results Pertaining to OSEP SPP/APR Indicator 8”.

³³ NCSEAM (2006). Use of the NCSEAM Family Survey to Address the SPP/APR Indicator on Family Outcomes available at: <http://www.accountabilitydata.org/ParentFamily%20Involvement%20Measures/June%206.pdf>.

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	2. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across indicators that will enhance the impact of discrete indicator activities (e.g., work with Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant; analyze across indicator-specific data sets; i.e., child find/identification rates).	<p>Michigan’s Mandated Activities Projects³⁴ (MAPs) created opportunities for the integrated activities personnel to meet to expand their knowledge of the impact of parent involvement.</p> <p>A two-day MAPs Community Learning Forum took place on <i>Dispositions and Practices on Parent Involvement</i>.</p> <p>http://www.cenmi.org/About/CommunityLearningForums/FacilitatedParentInvolvementMaterials.aspx#followUp</p> <p>Key topics that were addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining facilitated parent involvement. • Clarifying the significance of parent involvement. • Reviewing current practices and data. • Examining evidence-based dispositions and practices. <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families³⁵ participated in the design and delivery of this event. A follow up document - <i>Improving Family Involvement</i> was produced.</p> <p>http://www.cenmi.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=Pyk9dZd7cbo%3d&tabid=56</p> <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families also participated in four Leadership Team meetings, with representatives from the OSE and the MAPs.</p>

³⁴ Michigan’s state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

³⁵ Michigan’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)

Timelines	Activities	Status
EVALUATION		
2008-2011	<p>3. Provide evidence-based resource material to districts regarding strategies to facilitate parent involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide links on the WSU Website, the OSE Public Reporting website and the CIMS website to the material that the NCSEAM developed in collaboration with the Future of School Psychology Task Force on Family School Partnerships. • Recruit two Michigan’s MAPs whose work involves training and technical assistance (TA) to educators and administrators to explore the option of incorporating this resource into their existing TA resources. 	<p>The website remains: http://www.cus.wayne.edu/ecd</p> <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families continued the strong partnership work with the Michigan Special Education Mediation Program and the Michigan’s Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative.</p> <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families participated with other MAPs in the design of a conference that emphasized parent leadership in graduation and dropout prevention planning. The conference offered professional development to the Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners building teams.</p>
2007-2011	<p>4. Implement a comprehensive outreach plan to share:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the parent surveys. • The distribution methodology for the surveys. • The findings and meaning of Michigan’s baseline and subsequent APR measure scores. • Expectations that schools have responsibility for facilitating parent involvement. <p>This will be accomplished through presentations to districts and Parent Advisory Committees regarding survey results both in person and using technology.</p>	<p>Informational materials were developed for distribution in FFY 2011.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported preschool (3-5) data for this indicator are 47.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 36%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 35%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported school-age (6-21) data for this indicator are 26.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 25.1%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 21.5%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 9 (Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In accordance with the new federal reporting requirements, both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 data were reviewed using the new seven race and ethnicity codes specified by the United States Department of Education (USED).
Specifically:
 - a. A student coded as Hispanic, is reported as Hispanic, regardless of any additional race codes indicated.
 - b. All other students coded in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) with multiple races, are counted in the new "Two or More Races" category.
3. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, the state definition/calculation using the resident district for analyzing disproportionate representation was revised. For further information please see the Business Rules in Appendix B.
4. Selection criteria were updated to identify districts as candidates for focused monitoring activities.
5. The Office of Special Education (OSE) collaborated with the Center for Educational Networking (CEN) to continue to inform school districts about disproportionality through the publication of an eight page journal dedicated to the topics of disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality. (*Focus on Results*, May 2011)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability
(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2009, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a); e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum "n" size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in

which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009 reporting period; i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

Michigan’s operational definition of districts with disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification includes:

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
Step 1: Identify Districts with Disproportionate Representation	For the FFY 2010 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011). A verified ratio ³⁶ >2.5 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.	For the FFY 2010 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011). A verified ratio <0.4 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
Step 2: Analysis of Identification Policies, Procedures and Practices	<p>The OSE completed on-site focused monitoring visits for districts that were identified with disproportionate data for the first time or were monitored prior to the 2009-2010 school year and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • had a risk ratio of 2.51 to 2.99 in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 and an upward trend, or • had a risk ratio the first year below 3.0 and the second year greater than 3.0. <p>The OSE reviewed district processes and student records, and conducted interviews to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices. This resulted in a focused</p>	<p>The OSE conducted a desk audit that included a review of the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) student achievement data for districts with a verified ratio of <0.4 for two consecutive years. For those districts where the percentage of students in a given racial/ethnic group at the lowest MEAP proficiency level was greater than the overall district percentage of students in the lowest proficiency level, the OSE required a self-review of identification policies, procedures and practices. After state staff verification this resulted in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p>

³⁶In cases where the sum of all other students with disabilities equals fewer than ten, an alternate risk ration (ARR) was calculated for the race under consideration, per Data Accountability Center’s recommendation. A risk ratio (RR) was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district’s student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate weighted risk ratios/ARRs. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district’s student population.

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
	<p>monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance. All other districts above the threshold were required to complete a desk audit. The desk audit consisted of district staff, in collaboration with the intermediate school district (ISD) monitor, completing a series of probe questions and reviewing student records to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices. The OSE and select ISD monitors then verified the submitted desk audits and determined whether findings were to be issued. This resulted in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p>	

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2006	0.3%	0%	
2007		0%	0.3%
2008		0%	0.1%
2009		0%	0.1%
2010		0%	*0.2%
<p>Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*[2 ÷ 812] X 100</p>			

Sources: Michigan Compliance Information System, the Single Record Student Database, MSDS

During 2010-2011, the OSE analyzed FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 data for 812 districts; of those districts 167 were excluded from the disproportionate representation calculations because they had fewer than 30 students with disabilities enrolled. Based on the focused monitoring selection criteria, nine districts were identified for

focused monitoring activities (five for over-representation and four for under-representation). Two of the districts with over-representation of Black students were found to have inappropriate identification policies, procedures, and/or practices as represented in the table above. There were no findings for districts with under-representation due to inappropriate identification. An additional eight districts had disproportionate representation data, but had been monitored the previous year and were in the year of correction.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of zero percent for Indicator 9. In FFY 2010 Michigan's performance remained at less than one percent.

For FFY 2010, seventeen districts were identified with disproportionate representation. Five of seventeen districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over-representation—three because of over-representation of Black students, one because of over-representation of American Indian students and one because of over-representation of White students. Four of the districts participated in a focused monitoring on-site review of their identification policies, procedures and practices. The fifth district, which had a risk ratio the first year greater than 3.0, and the second year between 2.5 and 3.0, participated in a desk audit. Two of the districts with over-representation of Black students were found to have inappropriate identification policies, procedures and/or practices. The remaining three districts did not have findings of noncompliance.

For FFY 2010, twelve of seventeen districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to under-representation, eleven because of under-representation of Asian students and one because of under-representation of White students. Eight of the districts had participated in a desk audit or self-review in the fall 2010 focused monitoring cycle, had no findings, but whose data were disproportionate in the same racial/ethnic group received an alert in the Monitoring Activities Report in the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) August 15 workbook. The alert will ensure that the district is aware of the disproportionate representation data. The three districts whose data was disproportionate for the first time and one district whose data was disproportionate in a different racial/ethnic group participated in a MEAP desk audit. There were no findings of noncompliance for any of the 12 districts.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	1. The OSE will provide professional development to ISD monitors in order to address issues regarding disproportionate representation.	ISD monitors with districts selected for focused monitoring activities participated in training in September 2010. Common findings and resources were shared. Additional support was provided via monthly Community of Practice (COP) webinars.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2011	2. The OSE will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information to refine data collection issues and alignment with new Office of Management and Budget (OMB) multiracial/ethnic coding.	<p>Because Michigan uses a two-year pattern of data to identify districts with disproportionate representation, a bridging methodology was implemented for data analysis and reporting for FFY 2010.</p> <p>In accordance with the new federal reporting requirements, both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 data were reviewed using the new seven race/ethnicity codes specified by the USED. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student coded as Hispanic, is reported as Hispanic, regardless of any additional race codes indicated. • All other students coded in the MSDS with multiple races, are counted in the new "Two or More Races" category.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006 -2011	<p>3. Conduct ongoing literature reviews to identify the determinants and appropriate interventions for disproportionate representation.</p> <p>Study districts that in fact exhibit the determinants but do not have disproportionate representation issues.</p>	<p>The OSE continued to update the information available to school districts regarding research-based practices for eliminating disproportionate representation. This information is available on the Web page at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html</p> <p>Web page information continues to be routinely shared through training offered to technical assistance (TA) providers.</p> <p>The OSE continued to review state assessment data for under-represented</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>populations within identified districts to determine if there was a correlation between race/ethnicity, student achievement and identification for special education services.</p> <p>States shared methodologies and strategies with colleagues through the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) special education subcommittee and North Central Regional Resource Center conference calls.</p> <p>The OSE collaborated with the CEN to continue to inform school districts about disproportionality through the publication of an eight page newsletter dedicated to the topics of disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality. (<i>Focus on Results, May 2011</i>)</p>
2006-2011	4. Meet semi-annually to recommend ways to analyze and address disproportionate representation data issues.	<p>The OSE data advisory committee met three times during the FFY 2010, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p> <p>No new issues related to disproportionate representation surfaced from the group.</p>
2006-2011	5. Notify local educational entities (LEAs) of their disproportionate representation status and the appropriate level of intervention to begin and complete the verification process.	<p>In May 2011, the OSE notified school districts of their disproportionate representation data for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.</p> <p>The OSE and Wayne State University continued to offer the use of the Web page for districts to verify and, if needed, recalculate data for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.</p> <p>In August 2011, districts were notified of required fall 2011 monitoring activities through the <i>CIMS Workbook</i>.</p>
2007–2011	6. Redesign the CIMS self-review and improvement plan processes to more comprehensively address issues of disproportionate representation.	<p>The state-verified self-review process is now in the <i>CIMS Workbook</i>. Included under the Focused Monitoring tab for use by the district's Review and Analysis Process teams are the Notification Letter, Indicator Data Reports, and Data Portraits. A template with probe questions and local evidence/conclusions guides the self-review.</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		This is submitted electronically and verified by the OSE Continuous Improvement and Compliance staff. Districts with findings of noncompliance are assigned a state TA provider and are required to develop a corrective action plan. How-to documents outlining the required procedures were developed and posted to the CIMS website.
2007-2011	7. The OSE will annually review the calculations used to determine disproportionate representation and adjust the business rules based on district patterns analyzed to yield an increasingly accurate approach.	<p>The OSE reviewed the calculations and business rules for disproportionate representation to determine if adjustments were warranted. The specific area of focus for the FFY 2010 review was the seven racial/ethnic category change.</p> <p>The OSE continued to seek guidance regarding data issues during FFY 2010 from the national EIMAC special education subcommittee, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Data Managers group and at the OSEP Leadership Conference.</p>
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	<p>8. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • Michigan’s Mandated Activities Projects³⁷ <p>Michigan’s emerging work with the NCSEAM³⁸ General Supervision Framework</p>	Through the use of the CIMS, the OSE developed and implemented an integrated set of activities by aligning data collection, analysis, reporting, and corrective action activities across indicators.

³⁷ Michigan’s state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) administrative set-aside funds

³⁸ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring

Timelines	Activities	Status
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2007-2011	9. The OSE will convene a diverse advisory committee composed of general education and special education stakeholders, data experts, institutions of higher education faculty and members of professional organizations to meet semi-annually.	<p>The OSE data advisory committee continued to consider issues of disproportionate representation as one of its tasks.</p> <p>This advisory committee met three times during FFY 2010, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2007-2011	10. Present information and gather input at conferences and key meetings with key stakeholder groups in order to enhance awareness of issues and prevention strategies, as well as necessary corrective actions.	<p>Representatives of the OSE participated in EIMAC, OSEP meetings and Regional Resource Center TA calls. The OSE provided updates at special education administrative meetings. Additionally, presentations regarding the CIMS and focused monitoring lessons learned were provided at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association Conference • Michigan Council of Exceptional Children State Conference • Upper Peninsula Annual Conference • Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education³⁹ Summer Institute • Michigan Association of Public School Academies Conference • Special Education Advisory Committee⁴⁰ • ISD monitor meetings • Monthly COP webinars.
2007-2011	11. Design and maintain a Web page with resources and links to critical information on disproportionate representation.	<p>The OSE expanded the Web page found at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html</p> <p>The Web page included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • information about disproportionate representation including the <i>Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate</i>

³⁹ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

⁴⁰ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p><i>Representation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> links to agencies and organizations that can assist school districts research best practice literature regarding disproportionate representation. <p>Information about the updated Web page was presented to monitoring teams for use during site visits and to TA providers for dissemination to districts. It has been shared with all districts monitored for disproportionate representation.</p>
2007-2011	12. The OSE will prepare resource materials and develop and disseminate products, tools, and training based on IDEA requirements for Child Find.	<p>Each district identified with findings was required to improve and correct Child Find strategies and interventions as part of the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) through the CIMS process.</p> <p>The OSE identified and updated guidance documents regarding Child Find. This was included in the September 2010 training for focused monitoring teams and posted to the www.cims.cenmi.org website.</p>
2007-2011	13. The OSE will provide TA regarding CAPs related to noncompliance and assist LEAs in revising policies, procedures and/or practices.	As part of the CIMS process, a TA provider was assigned to each district identified with findings of noncompliance to assist with the development and implementation of CAPs to ensure appropriate policies, procedures and practices. The TA provider worked with the district until correction was verified and the finding closed.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	1
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	1
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.1%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 districts, including one district that had been monitored during the previous year and was implementing a corrective action plan, were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012 demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311,</p>	<p>The district identified in the FFY 2009 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures and practices has corrected all findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>The OSE verified that all findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of notification, including that the district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and the district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 144 of 755 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 children with disabilities enrolled, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to report in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, the total number of districts identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, including those districts that had been previously identified in FFY 2008. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with the OSEP’s Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The OSE TA provider verified, through on-site visits, the completion of the district’s corrective action plan activities, which included the development of procedures and subsequent staff training. Additionally the TA provider and the ISD monitor conducted a random review of new student records and verified that all met requirements per the new procedures. All areas of noncompliance were corrected and verified.</p> <p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 10 (Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In accordance with the new federal reporting requirements, both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 data were reviewed using the new seven race and ethnicity codes specified by the United States Department of Education (USED).
Specifically:
 - a. A student coded as Hispanic, is reported as Hispanic, regardless of any additional race codes indicated.
 - b. All other students coded in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) with multiple races, are counted in the new "Two or More Races" category.
3. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, the state definition/calculation using the resident district for analyzing disproportionate representation was revised. For further information please see the Business Rules in Appendix B.
4. Selection criteria were updated to identify districts as candidates for focused monitoring activities.
5. The Office of Special Education (OSE) collaborated with the Center for Educational Networking (CEN) to continue to inform school districts about disproportionality through the publication of an eight page journal dedicated to the topics of disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality (*Focus on Results*, May 2011).

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a); e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum "n" size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made

after the end of the FFY 2008; i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

Michigan’s operational definition of districts with disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification includes:

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
Step 1: Identify Districts with Disproportionate Representation	For the FFY 2010 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011). A verified ratio ⁴¹ >2.5 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.	For the FFY 2010 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011). A verified ratio <0.4 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
Step 2: Analysis of Identification Policies, Procedures and Practices	<p>The OSE completed on-site focused monitoring visits for districts that were identified with disproportionate data for the first time or were monitored prior to the 2009-2010 school year and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • had a risk ratio of 2.51 to 2.99 in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 and an upward trend, or • had a risk ratio the first year below 3.0 and the second year greater than 3.0. <p>The OSE reviewed district processes and student records, and conducted interviews to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices. This resulted in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance. All other districts above the threshold were required to complete a desk audit. The desk audit consisted of district staff, in</p>	<p>The OSE conducted a desk audit that included a review of the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) student achievement data for districts with a verified ratio of <0.4 for two consecutive years. For those districts where the percentage of students in a given racial/ethnic group at the lowest MEAP proficiency level was greater than the overall district percentage of students in the lowest proficiency level, the OSE required a self-review of identification policies, procedures and practices. After state staff verification this resulted in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p>

⁴¹In cases where the sum of all other students with disabilities equals fewer than ten, an alternate risk ratio (ARR) was calculated for the race under consideration, per Data Accountability Center’s recommendation. A risk ratio (RR) was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district’s student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate weighted risk ratios/ARR. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district’s student population.

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
	collaboration with the intermediate school district (ISD) monitor, completing a series of probe questions and reviewing student records to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices. The OSE and select ISD monitors then verified the submitted desk audits and determined whether findings were to be issued. This resulted in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.	

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	1.7%		
2006		0%	3.2%
2007		0%	1.7%
2008		0%	1.4%
2009		0%	0.9%
2010		0%	*0.7%
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100. $* [6 \div 812] \times 100$			

Sources: Michigan Compliance Information System, the Single Record Student Database, MSDS

During 2010-2011, the OSE analyzed FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 data for 812 districts; of those districts, 167 were excluded from the disproportionate representation calculations because they had fewer than 30 students with disabilities enrolled. Based on the focused monitoring selection criteria, 61 districts were identified for a focused monitoring activity; 20 for over-representation only, 34 for under-representation only, and seven for both over- and under-representation. Six districts were found to have disproportionate over-representation due to inappropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. An additional five

districts had disproportionate representation data, but had been monitored the previous year and were in the year of correction.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of zero percent for Indicator 10. Of the 61 districts with data indicating over- or under-representation, six districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over-representation as a result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices. Four districts were identified because of over-representation of Black students; one with over-representation in the area of cognitive impairment, two because of over-representation in the area of specific learning disability and one because of over-representation in the area of speech and language impairment. One district was identified because of over-representation of White students in the area of other health impairment. One district was identified because of over-representation of students with specific learning disability in the area of Two or More Races.

Five of the six districts participated in on-site monitoring activities. Each of the five developed a corrective action plan (CAP) with technical assistance (TA) provided by the OSE. The final district, that had a risk ratio in the first year greater than 3.0 and the second year between 2.51 and 3.0, participated in a desk audit.

FFY 2010 Disproportionate Representation Analysis: Number and percent of identified districts by disability category and racial/ethnic group.

	Autism Spectrum Disorder		Cognitive Impairment		Emotional Impairment		Other Health Impairment		Specific Learning Disability		Speech and Language Impairment	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Black or African American	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	1	0.1%
Hispanic/Latino	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Two or More Races	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	1. The OSE will provide professional development to ISD monitors in order to address issues regarding disproportionate representation.	ISD monitors with districts selected for focused monitoring activities participated in training in September 2010. Common findings and resources were shared. Additional support was provided via monthly Community of Practice (COP) webinars.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2011	2. The OSE will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information to refine data collection issues and alignment with new Office of Management and Budget multiracial/ethnic coding.	<p>Because Michigan annually uses a two-year pattern of data to identify districts with disproportionate representation, a bridging methodology was implemented for data analysis and reporting for FFY 2010.</p> <p>In accordance with the new federal reporting requirements, both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 data were reviewed using the new seven race/ethnicity codes specified by the USED.</p>
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	<p>3. Conduct ongoing literature reviews to identify the determinants and appropriate interventions for disproportionate representation.</p> <p>Study districts that in fact exhibit the determinants but do not have disproportionate representation issues.</p>	<p>The OSE continued to update the information available to school districts about research-based practices for eliminating disproportionate representation. This information is available on the Web page at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html</p> <p>Web page information continues to be routinely shared through training offered to TA providers.</p> <p>The OSE continued to review state assessment data for under-represented populations within identified districts to determine if there was a correlation between race/ethnicity, student achievement and identification for special education services.</p> <p>States shared methodologies and strategies with colleagues through the Education Information Management Advisory</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>Consortium (EIMAC) special education subcommittee and North Central Resource Center conference calls.</p> <p>The OSE collaborated with the CEN to continue to inform school districts about disproportionality through the publication of an eight page journal dedicated to the topics of disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality (<i>Focus on Results</i>, May 2011).</p>
2006-2011	4. Meet semi-annually to recommend ways to analyze and address disproportionate representation data issues.	<p>The OSE data advisory committee met three times during the FFY 2010, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p> <p>No new issues related to disproportionate representation surfaced from the group.</p>
2006-2011	5. Notify local educational entities (LEAs) of their disproportionate representation status and the appropriate level of intervention to begin and complete the verification process.	<p>In May 2011, the OSE notified school districts of their disproportionate representation data for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.</p> <p>The OSE and Wayne State University continued to offer the use of the Web page for districts to verify and, if needed, recalculate data for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010.</p>
2007-2011	6. The OSE will annually review the calculations used to determine disproportionate representation and adjust the business rules based on district patterns analyzed to yield an increasingly accurate approach.	<p>The OSE reviewed the calculations and business rules for disproportionate representation to determine if adjustments were warranted. The specific area of focus for the FFY 2010 review was the seven racial/ethnic category change.</p> <p>The OSE continued to seek guidance regarding data issues during FFY 2010 from the national EIMAC special education subcommittee, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Data Managers group and at the OSEP Leadership Conference.</p>
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	7. Use a listserv to distribute information about culturally proficient systems for LEA and ISD staff.	<p>LEA and ISD staff members continued to implement the strategies of recognizing cultural bias and improving communication skills learned through participation in the Michigan Special Education Mediation Project</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		training. The training sensitized mediators to cultural differences in order to improve the productivity of individualized education program team meetings and decisions about students' eligibility, programs and services.
2008-2011	<p>8. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • Michigan's Mandated Activities Projects⁴² • Michigan's emerging work with the NCSEAM⁴³ General Supervision Framework. 	Through involvement with the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS), the OSE developed and implemented an integrated set of activities by aligning data collection, analysis, reporting, and corrective action activities across indicators.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2007-2011	9. The OSE will convene a diverse advisory committee composed of general education and special education stakeholders, data experts, institutions of higher education faculty and members of professional organizations to meet semi-annually.	<p>The OSE data advisory committee continued to consider issues of disproportionate representation as one of its tasks.</p> <p>This advisory committee met three times during FFY 2010, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2007-2011	10. Present information and gather input at conferences and key meetings with key stakeholder groups in order to enhance awareness of issues and prevention strategies, as	Representatives of the OSE participated in EIMAC, OSEP meetings and Regional Resource Center TA calls. The OSE provided updates at special education administrative meetings. Additionally, presentations regarding the CIMS and focused monitoring lessons learned were provided at the following:

⁴² Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) administrative set-aside funds

⁴³ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring

Timelines	Activities	Status
	well as necessary corrective actions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association Conference • Michigan Council of Exceptional Children State Conference • Upper Peninsula Annual Conference • Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education⁴⁴ Summer Institute • Michigan Association of Public School Academies Conference • Special Education Advisory Committee⁴⁵ • ISD monitor meetings • Monthly COP webinars.
2007-2011	11. Design and maintain a Web page with resources and links to critical information on disproportionate representation.	<p>The OSE expanded the Web page found at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html</p> <p>The Web page included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • information about disproportionate representation including the <i>Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation</i> • links to agencies and organizations that can assist school districts research best practice literature regarding disproportionate representation. <p>Information about the updated Web page was presented to monitoring teams for use during site visits and to TA providers for dissemination to districts. It has been shared with all districts monitored for disproportionate representation.</p>
2007-2011	12. The OSE will prepare resource materials and develop and disseminate products, tools and training modules based on research-based results of effective Child Find interventions and identification practices.	<p>Each district identified with findings was required to improve and correct Child Find strategies and interventions as part of the development of a CAP through the CIMS process.</p> <p>The OSE identified and updated guidance documents regarding Child Find. This was included in the September 2010 training for focused monitoring teams and posted to the www.cims.cenmi.org website.</p>

⁴⁴ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children

⁴⁵ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel

Timelines	Activities	Status
2007-2011	13. The OSE will provide TA regarding CAPs related to noncompliance and assist LEAs in revising policies, procedures and/or practices.	As part of the CIMS process, a TA provider was assigned to each district identified with findings of noncompliance to assist with the development and implementation of CAPs to ensure appropriate policies, procedures and practices. The TA provider worked with the district until correction was verified and the finding(s) closed.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	13
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	13
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 62 districts, including 6 districts that had been monitored in the previous year and were in their year of correction, were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that seven districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories 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, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of</p>	<p>The districts identified in FFY 2009 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups in special education and related services that were the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices or procedures have corrected all findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>The OSE verified that all findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of notification, including that the districts are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and the districts have corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with the OSEP’s Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The OSE TA provider verified, through on-site visits, the completion of the district’s corrective action plan activities, which included the development of procedures and subsequent staff training. Additionally the TA provider and the ISD monitor conducted a</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State reported that 144 of 755 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 children with disabilities enrolled, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that 20 of 21 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by May 12, 2010.</p>	<p>noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>random review of new student records and verified that all met requirements per the new procedures. All areas of noncompliance were corrected and verified.</p> <p>The OSE reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 11 (Child Find) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education (OSE) intensified collaborative efforts within and across its units to collect and verify data, disseminate accurate information and provide technical assistance (TA) to all stakeholders about Child Find and the timely completion of the initial evaluation and individualized education program (IEP).

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Child Find (Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	80.5% ⁴⁶		
2006		100%	96.2%
2007		100%	87.1%
2008		100%	95.3%
2009		100%	99.1%
2010		100%	99.4% *
Percent = [(# of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or agreed upon extension) divided by (# of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received)] times 100.			
*[23,321 ÷ 23,461] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

⁴⁶ Based on the OSEP approved cohort with data from one-third of the state. Since that time, Michigan has moved to a statewide data collection.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 11. However, there was a 0.3 percent increase from FFY 2009.

Michigan’s continued high percentage of compliance for this indicator can be partly attributed to the TA and outreach provided through the OSE Continuous Improvement and Compliance (CIC) and Program Accountability (PA) Units. Through the CIC Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS), districts were provided with ongoing support and access to current and consistent information. The OSE PA Unit is involved with the Data Advisory Committee and with staff from the Performance Reporting Unit in the development and refinement of data collection for Indicator 11. The PA Unit, with stakeholder input, revised a section of the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (MARSE) and added a new Part to the MARSE to further clarify and ensure accuracy in identifying initial evaluations and calculating appropriate timelines.

Analysis of Child Find Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010

	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
(a) # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.	25,414	23,461
(b) # of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or a mutually agreed upon extension.	25,179	23,321
# of children included in (a) but not included in (b).	235	140

Source: MSDS

For the late IEPs, the following table presents the reasons districts gave and the number and percent of eligible and ineligible children reported for each reason.

Reason for Late IEP	Eligible Children with Late IEPs	Ineligible Children with Late IEPs
Personnel unavailable to complete within timeline	43 (35.8%)	8 (40.0%)
Required external evaluation/report delayed	37 (30.8%)	9 (45.0%)
Other	40 (33.3%)	3 (15.0%)

Source: MSDS

For the late IEPs, the number of calendar days beyond the required 30 school day timeline⁴⁷ (or agreed upon extension) ranged from one day to 156 days. The following table presents the number and percent of late IEPs by range of days late.

⁴⁷ Michigan’s state established timeframe within which the evaluation must be completed per MARSE.

Range of Days Beyond 30	Number (Percent) of Late IEPs
1-5 days	37 (26.4%)
6-10 days	30 (21.4%)
11-15 days	19 (13.6%)
16-20 days	7 (5.0%)
21-25 days	9 (6.4%)
26-30 days	14 (10.0%)
> 30 days	24 (17.1%)

Source: MSDS

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2011	1. Revise all necessary data fields to gather required information for future APRs.	The MSDS components and characteristics are reviewed annually and updated as necessary to clarify the distinction between compliant and noncompliant initial evaluations as well as the reasons for late evaluations. The component and characteristics were developed with input from stakeholders.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	2. Continue to collaborate with workgroups to review and update, as necessary, Michigan’s Child Find process.	Several workgroups were convened in collaboration with the Mandated Activities Projects ⁴⁸ (MAPs), including parent training and advocacy groups. These workgroups continued to clarify federal and state Child Find requirements and developed guidance for dissemination to stakeholders.

⁴⁸ Michigan’s state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) administrative set-aside funds.

Timelines	Activities	Status
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2006-2011	3. Establish and maintain a workgroup to completely revise Michigan’s Child Find process. Include, at minimum, stakeholders from special education, general education, early childhood education, safe schools, community service providers, agency service providers, the health field, institutions of higher education (including community colleges) and the community at large.	A Child Find policy communication workgroup, a policy and procedures manual workgroup, a Child Find corrective action plan (CAP) review team, and a program accountability advisory team were convened throughout FFY 2010 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review state guidance for accuracy. • Clarify state guidance. • Communicate to stakeholders state guidance about the IDEA and the <i>Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education</i> Child Find requirements. Additionally, the CAP review team directly communicated Child Find system requirements to local districts through the CIMS communication network.
2008-2011	4. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The General Supervision indicators • Michigan’s MAPs • Michigan’s monitoring system 	The OSE policy staff led an integrated effort to disseminate accurate information regarding federal regulations and state rule requirements for completion of the initial evaluation and IEP.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2006-2011	5. Disseminate information on the modifications to the data collection system and the data collection requirements to the field in the form of data collection manuals and TA models.	The OSE Performance Reporting Unit continued to work collaboratively with the Center for Educational Performance and Information and the Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association to provide local district data personnel and special education administrators with TA to improve data accuracy.

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

FFY 2009 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
2	11	2	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2010, based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The district implemented all activities of the CAP but the district's data was not 100 percent compliant. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on November 3, 2011.</p>

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	87
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational agency (LEA) of the finding)	86
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	1

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 467 of 533 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner and that 60 findings were subsequently corrected by November 17, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported on the actions it took to address the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining six uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected</p>	<p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and revision was not needed to ensure timely correction of noncompliance identified by Michigan in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and the OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>All of the 6 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data have been corrected and verified by the state as (1) correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a state data system; and (2) having completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Of the 87 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, 87 were</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>corrected and verified by the state as (1) correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a state data system; and (2) having completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Verification of the correction was completed through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of new student records demonstrating 100 percent compliance. 2. A review of documentation of completed activities detailed in the CAP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Findings of non-compliance were reported and Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) were submitted and monitored through the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) workbook.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Early Childhood Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an individualized education program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a) # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b) # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c) # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d) # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e) # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	92.1%		
2006		100%	91.5%
2007		100%	93.9%
2008		100%	97.8%
2009		100%	98.7%
2010		100%	98.6% *
Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.			
* [3,689 ÷ (4,048 – 173 – 49 – 84)] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), data verification survey

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 12. The FFY 2010 compliance rate of 98.6 percent represents a decrease of 0.1 percent, which is not statistically significant, from 2009-2010 (98.7 percent). This represents an increase of 6.5 percent from the 2004-2005 baseline (92.1 percent).

In 2010-2011, 4,048 children being served in Part C were referred to Part B for eligibility determination. Of these children, 53 had late IEPs. These were distributed across 28 local school districts [from 17 of Michigan’s intermediate school districts (ISDs)]. Among the 17 ISDs with late IEPs, most had one to three late IEPs. Most IEPs were developed and implemented within 60 days of the child’s third birthday. All of the 53 children with late IEPs had IEPs developed and implemented during the 2010-2011 year. Districts identified reasons for noncompliance using the following primary reporting categories: late notification from Part C, personnel unavailable and extenuating family circumstance (see tables on next page). Districts made particular note of staff shortages due to funding cuts, which could account for some of the slippage that occurred for FFY 2010.

Increased training and technical assistance (TA) opportunities offered by the Office of Special Education (OSE) and the Office of Early Childhood Education & Family Services (ECE&FS) staff assisted locals to identify and ensure correction of noncompliance and increase collaboration between the Part C and Part B systems. Through the CIMS process districts were notified, offered tools for systemic data improvement and developed a process for locals to improve the transition process.

Many ISDs developed plans and interagency agreements that lead to stronger compliance and improved transitions of children from Part C to Part B.

The children included in category a, but not included in b, c, d or e represent those whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays. During data verification, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) learned that some districts did not have clear procedures and protocols for the transition between Part C exit and Part B entry. Based upon data verification, districts receiving findings of noncompliance for Part C to Part B transition were required to complete a CAP process to ensure correction. Districts need to address personnel issues in CAPs and ensure that on-time completion of IEPs even with staff shortages. CAPs need to identify a plan to develop timely IEPs despite acknowledged staff shortage issues. Those districts completing CAPs verified Indicator 12 data quarterly through data logs until compliance was achieved and verified. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year including verification.

Analysis of Early Childhood Transition Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010

	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	4,647	4,048
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.	144	173
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	4,252	3,689
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	35	49
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	158	84

Sources: MI-CIS, data verification survey

The following table presents the reasons districts gave for late IEPs and the number of eligible and ineligible children reported with each reason:

Reason for Late IEP	Number of Eligible Children with Late IEPs	Number of Ineligible Children with Late IEPs
Late notification from Part C (less than 90 days before third birthday)	10	2
Extenuating family circumstances	4	0
Unable to arrange mutually agreeable evaluation/IEP times	1	0
Personnel unavailable to complete within timeline	11	0
Timeline began in previous district	1	0
Unknown	22	2
Total	49	4

Sources: MI-CIS, data verification survey

The following tables present the number of districts with late IEPs:

Number of Late IEPs	Number of Districts
1	17
2 - 3	9
≥ 4	2

Number of IEPs	Number of Days Late
15	1-10
18	11-50
9	51-100
11	>100

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2009-2011	1. The MDE will work with the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System redesign (CIMS) system, districts and <i>Early On</i> [®] Training and Technical Assistance (EOT&TA)	In partnership with the Office of ECE&FS staff, EOT&TA developed and delivered TA activities for Part C field staff regarding transition from Part C to Part B. This TA was incorporated into scheduled conferences and

Timelines	Activities	Status
	to develop and monitor transition training and TA activities from Part C to Part B.	district workshops. EOT&TA and personnel from the Office of ECE&FS conducted joint visits to districts with noncompliance to provide training and conduct student record reviews to verify correction of noncompliance for instance, districts with late notification from Part C received targeted TA with combined Part B and Part C staff.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2010-2011	2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect data in the new fields during December collection. Verify accuracy with LEA feedback. • Collect and verify self review data. • Explore further the extension of Part C services as an option afforded in <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>. • Collaborate with the Office of ECE&FS in order to improve transition from Part C to Part B services. 	All activities have been completed in collaboration with the Office of ECE&FS to verify data and improve transition from Part C to Part B services.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2011	3. Identify LEAs determined to be out of compliance and target for TA and appropriate corrective action.	Using FFY 2009 data, the process of identifying districts out of compliance began during the reporting year. The actions taken to address instances of noncompliance are described in the Correction of FFY 2009 Noncompliance section. This indicator was included as an element in the 2011 Part B district determinations.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2008-2011	4. Develop and implement a more integrated set of	This indicator was included in the CIMS.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FAPE in the LRE⁴⁹ SPP indicators • Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant • Michigan’s emerging work with the NCSEAM⁵⁰ General Supervision Framework 	The Office of ECE&FS continued funding two subgrants to provide TA, professional development and data analysis reporting. One example of TA includes a series of webinars for Part C and Part B staff developed to ensure seamless transition of children from Part C to Early Childhood Special Education programs and services.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	20
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	18
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	2

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	2
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	2
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

⁴⁹ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

⁵⁰ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
3	12	3	The district did not conduct all early childhood transition IEPs in a timely manner.	<p>Finding Issued: December 15, 2009, based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The district implemented all activities of the CAP but the district's data was not 100 percent compliant. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on February 18, 2011.</p>
4	12	4	The district did not conduct all early childhood transition IEPs in a timely manner.	<p>Finding Issued: December 15, 2009, based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The district implemented all activities of the CAP but the district's data was not 100 percent compliant. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on February 16, 2011.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 104 of 109 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining five findings subsequently were corrected by September 15, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and revision was not needed to ensure timely correction of noncompliance identified by Michigan in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and the OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The districts associated with the two uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 developed a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submitted progress reports. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved. These two uncorrected noncompliance findings were verified and closed by the OSE in 2011.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Michigan exceeds the minimum reporting requirement for Indicator 13 by requiring each district to participate annually in the statewide secondary transition student record checklist sampling.
3. In FFY 2010, to improve data quality, both the list of students in the sample and the data entry process were integrated into the *Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook*.
4. Districts with Indicator 13 findings of non-compliance were notified and corrective action plans submitted, reviewed, monitored and verified through the CIMS.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision / Secondary Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	74.3%	100%	74.3%
2010		100%	99.2% *
Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100. *[9,193 ÷ 9,267] X 100			

Sources: CIMS, Secondary Transition Checklist

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet the FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 13; however, there was an increase of 24.9 percent compared to the baseline. Progress from the baseline for Indicator 13 resulted from the following activities:

- Integrated the Secondary Transition Checklist into the CIMS for 2010-2011. This provided additional oversight and verification of IEP compliance and allowed the Michigan Department of Education to track and support the timely submission of the data.
- Increased staff completion rates of online training modules.
- Improved communication to districts of compliance requirements through the Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP).
- Alignment of timeframes, process, roles and reporting results with the *CIMS Workbook* improved clarity.

Discussion of FFY 2010 Data:

Representativeness of sample

Using the OSEP approved sampling frame, a sample of 9,267 IEPs was obtained. This sample was checked for representativeness (for age, race/ethnicity, gender and disability) against the population of eligible students from the annual Special Education Child Count. A proportions test was used to determine if the sample varied significantly from the population of eligible students on age, race/ethnicity and disability. This test was conducted at the state level and for Michigan's only district with more than 50,000 enrolled students.

Presented in Table 1 are the results of the analyses indicating that there were significant differences between the population of eligible students and the final

Indicator 13 sample for the largest district for students with cognitive impairment and other health impairment. Weights were applied to each demographic category that varied significantly from the population to compute a weighted compliance rate. The largest district's FFY 2010 compliance rate of 100 percent was then compared to weighted results by the two over-represented demographic categories. The weighted compliance rate of 100 percent does not vary significantly from the unweighted compliance rate.

Table 1: Comparison of Population and Sample (Largest District)				
Disability Category	Special Education Child Count Population	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample Population	Sample Percent
Autism Spectrum Disorder	133	4.6%	3	3.1%
Deaf-Blindness	0	0%	0	0%
Emotional Impairment	150	5.2%	5	5.2%
Hearing Impairment	62	2.2%	1	1.0%
Severe Multiple Impairment	94	3.3%	1	1.0%
Cognitive Impairment*	858	29.9%	38	39.6%
Other Health Impairment*	80	2.8%	7	7.3%
Physical Impairment	29	1.0%	1	1.0%
Specific Learning Disability	1,390	48.4%	39	40.6%
Speech & Language Impairment	53	1.8%	1	1.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	11	0.4%	0	0%
Visual Impairment	10	0.3%	0	0%

* Difference between Special Education Child Count population and sample is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

As displayed in Table 2, there were also significant differences between the population of eligible students and the final Indicator 13 sample for certain ages, racial/ethnic groups and disabilities at the state level.

Table 2: Comparison of Population and Sample (state level)				
	Special Education Child Count Population	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample Population	Sample Percent
Age				
Age 16*	15,638	36.4%	3,744	40.4%
Age 17	14,552	33.9%	3,164	34.1%
Age 18*	7,649	17.8%	1,557	16.8%
Age 19*	2,454	5.7%	408	4.4%
Age 20*	1,475	3.4%	210	2.3%
Age 21*	1,174	2.7%	184	2.0%
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian*	445	1.0%	149	1.6%
Asian*	393	0.9%	64	0.7%
Black*	10,406	24.2%	1,371	14.8%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	39	0.1%	13	0.1%
White*	29,247	68.1%	7,171	77.4%
Hispanic	1,980	4.6%	393	4.2%
Two or More Races	432	1.0%	106	1.1%
Disability Category				
Autism Spectrum Disorder	2,892	6.7%	619	6.7%
Deaf-Blindness	6	0.0%	0	0.0%
Emotional Impairment*	4,173	9.7%	739	8.0%
Hearing Impairment	563	1.3%	108	1.2%
Severe Multiple Impairment*	1,063	2.5%	173	1.9%
Cognitive Impairment*	7,276	16.9%	1,435	15.5%
Other Health Impairment*	4,471	10.4%	1,029	11.1%
Physical Impairment	502	1.2%	109	1.2%
Specific Learning Disability*	20,874	48.6%	4,828	52.1%
Speech & Language Impairment	729	1.7%	137	1.5%
Traumatic Brain Injury	228	0.5%	53	0.6%
Visual Impairment	165	0.4%	37	0.4%

* Difference between Special Education Child Count population and sample is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

The significant variation in the sample percent compared to the population percent for these demographic categories can be partially explained by the data collection protocol that removes students who are no longer receiving services in their sampled district (e.g., the number of graduating students removed from the sample). The representativeness of the final sample was similarly affected in FFY 2009 across these demographic categories. Strategies to address these issues are being explored for FFY 2011 and the OSEP approval will be sought for any changes to the sampling protocol.

Weights were applied to each demographic category that varied significantly from the population to compute a weighted compliance rate. Michigan’s unweighted baseline FFY 2010 Indicator 13 compliance rate of 99.2 percent was then compared to weighted results for each of the demographic categories (age, race/ethnicity and disability). Weighted results were not significantly different than unweighted results, therefore unweighted results are reported.

FFY 2010 Indicator 13 Weighted and Unweighted Compliance Rates (state level)			
	N	# Compliant Records	Compliance Rate
Age (Weighted)	9,274	9,199	99.2%
Race/Ethnicity (Weighted)	9,238	9,158	99.1%
Disability (Weighted)	8,351	8,292	99.3%
[(# Compliant Records ÷ N) x 100 = Compliance Rate]			
UNWEIGHTED DATA	9,267	9,193	99.2%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance (TA) and personnel development for district staff to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	The <i>CIMS Workbook</i> provided the district Review and Analysis Process teams their performance for graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes. These data assisted noncompliant districts to conduct a root cause analysis and develop a corrective action plan for compliance with Indicator 13 and improved performance on Indicators 1, 2 and 14. Data based decision-making resources with probe questions across Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 were included in the <i>CIMS</i>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p><i>Workbook</i> and the work of Michigan’s Mandated Activities Projects⁵¹. These systems of support allowed districts to analyze and improve their performance for all indicators.</p>
2010-2011	<p>2. Provide sustained building-level personnel development using available district/building-level data to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.</p>	<p>MI-TOP, with National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) assistance, held six on-site transition-focus group conversations with intermediate school districts and their transition teams to gather and organize local data, utilizing the NSTTAC planning tool.</p> <p>The Office of Special Education (OSE) assisted in the development of the <i>Transition Planning Made Easier</i> and <i>Assessing for Transition</i> online training modules.</p> <p>Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners and MI-TOP worked with the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability staff and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation high school consultants to provide TA regarding these indicators (1, 2, 13 and 14).</p>
2010-2011	<p>3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.</p>	<p>The Michigan Rehabilitation Services and the OSE developed an interagency agreement to provide professional development/TA at joint-sponsored training events.</p> <p>During the MI-TOP conference, transition coordinators received newsletters, guidance documents and informational sessions regarding decision-making during the exit process that impacts student outcomes and district attainment of adequate yearly progress.</p>

⁵¹ Michigan’s state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	29
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational entity (LEA) of the finding)	29
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	0

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts	Although OSEP did not consider data for Indicator 13 in its determinations for FFY 2009, OSEP is concerned about the State’s very low FFY 2009 data (below 75%) for this indicator. In 2012, OSEP will consider the State’s FFY 2010 data for Indicator 13 in determinations. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due	The districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2009 have corrected all findings of noncompliance and are in compliance with the secondary transition requirements. Each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100%

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 74.3%.</p>	<p>February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Verification was completed through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of new student records demonstrating 100 percent compliance. 2. A review of documentation of completed activities detailed in the CAP. <p>The OSE verified that all findings of each individual case of noncompliance was corrected unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with the OSEP’s Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Alignment of timeframes, process, roles and reporting of results in the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> improved data collection, reporting accuracy and efficiency.</p> <p>The state has reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 14 (Postsecondary Outcomes) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The SPP targets for Indicator 14 were developed in 2009 with input from state and local educational agencies, the state Special Education Advisory Committee, Michigan Rehabilitation Services (MRS), and related Mandated Activities Projects⁵² (MAPs).
3. The state adopted the 2009 baseline, establishing three measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Postsecondary Outcomes

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had individualized education programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

⁵² Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
A. Percent enrolled in higher education			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	32.6%		32.6%
2010		34.3%	31.7%*
Percent enrolled in higher education (335) = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100. *[335 ÷ 1058] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	55.5%		55.5%
2010		58.4%	53.0%*
Percent enrolled in higher education (335) or competitively employed (226) = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100. *[(335 + 226) ÷ 1058] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2009	68.0%		68.0%
2010		71.4%	67.1%*
Percent enrolled in higher education (335), or in some other postsecondary education or training program (74); or competitively employed (226) or in some other employment (75) = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100. *[(335 + 74 + 226 + 75) ÷ 1058] X 100			

Source: National Post School Outcomes Center Survey

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for Indicator 14 in the three measurement categories. There were several factors that led to not meeting the targets:

- Michigan has been ranked as one of the ten states with the highest unemployment since the economic downturn. The rate of Indicator 14 slippage is congruent with the rising rate of unemployment in Michigan.
- The state established a new baseline, three measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities based on optimistic economic forecasts.
- The results for the urban districts showed low rates of performance, while non-urban statewide rates showed results that met Indicator 14 targets thus impacting the statewide performance.

Discussion of FFY 2010 Data:

Displayed in Table 1 are the weighted number of respondents within the four outcome categories for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010. There were decreases in the number of former students who were enrolled in higher education, who were competitively employed, and who were enrolled in some other postsecondary education/training program. There was a considerable increase in the number of former students that were in some other employment which is consistent with part-time employment during times of high unemployment.

Table 1: Weighted number of respondents by data outcome category

Outcome Category		FFY 2009		FFY 2010	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	414	32.6%	335	31.7%
2	Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	290	22.9%	226	21.4%
3	Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school	98	7.7%	74	7.0%
4	In some other employment within one year of leaving high school	60	4.7%	75	7.1%
Categories 1 through 4 - TOTAL		862	68.0%	710	67.1%
Leavers not captured by categories 1 through 4		406	32.0%	348	32.9%
TOTAL		1,268	100.0%	1,058	100%

Source: Modified National Post School Outcomes Center Survey

Representativeness of the respondent group

The National Post-School Outcomes Center's *Postsecondary Outcomes Survey* was used to collect information from former students who had exited school (graduated, dropped out, or received a certificate of completion) in the previous academic year.

Using the OSEP approved sampling plan, a total of 4,361 surveys were mailed to the cohort: 695 surveys were undeliverable and 1,058 responses were received (28.9 percent response rate). A proportions test was used to identify representativeness of the respondent group, compared to the cohort population, on gender, race/ethnicity, exit status and disability.

Presented in Table 1 are the results of the analyses indicating that White and Asian students were over-represented in the respondent group and Black students were under-represented. In terms of exit status, students who graduated from high school with a diploma were over-represented in the respondent group while those students who dropped out of high school were under-represented. Students with autism spectrum disorder and those with physical impairments were over-represented and students with emotional impairments were under-represented in the respondent group.

Table 2: Comparison of cohort population and respondent group				
Demographic Characteristics	Cohort Population		Respondent Group	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Race/Ethnicity				
White/Caucasian*	2,674	61.3%	717	67.9%
African-American/Black*	1,401	32.1%	282	26.7%
Hispanic/Latino	170	3.9%	29	2.7%
Asian*	22	0.5%	12	1.1%
American Indian	63	1.4%	14	1.3%
Pacific-Islander	3	0.1%	1	0.1%
Two or More Races	28	0.6%	3	0.3%
Exit status				
Dropped out*	654	15.0%	71	6.7%
Graduated*	3,636	83.4%	976	92.2%
Received certificate	71	1.6%	11	1.0%

Table 2: Comparison of cohort population and respondent group				
Demographic Characteristics	Cohort Population		Respondent Group	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Disability category				
Autism Spectrum Disorder*	144	3.3%	57	5.4%
Cognitive Impairment	478	11.0%	98	9.3%
Deaf-Blindness	1	0%	0	0%
Emotional Impairment*	423	9.7%	81	7.7%
Hearing Impairment	59	1.4%	20	1.9%
Other Health Impairment	392	9.0%	113	10.7%
Physical Impairment*	78	1.8%	32	3.0%
Severe Multiple Impairment	1	0%	0	0%
Specific Learning Disability	2,631	60.5%	614	58.0%
Speech & Language Impairment	105	2.4%	31	2.9%
Traumatic Brain Injury	16	0.4%	6	0.6%
Visual Impairment	20	0.5%	6	0.6%

* Difference between cohort population and respondent group is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Weights were applied to non-representative respondent groups. Differences between the respondent group and weighted respondent group for the race/ethnicity and disability categories were found not to be statistically significant. Differences between the respondent group and weighted respondent group for exit status were found to be statistically significant. This suggests that the respondent group is not representative in terms of students' exit status, thus, Indicator 14 results are affected in a statistically significant manner. Therefore, the state is reporting weighted exit status data for FFY 2010.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to	The Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook provided the district Review and Analysis Process teams their performance for graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes. This data assisted

Timelines	Activities	Status
	<p>develop and implement technical assistance (TA) and personnel development for district staff to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.</p>	<p>noncompliant districts to conduct a root cause analysis and develop a corrective action plan for compliance with Indicator 13 and improved performance on Indicators 1, 2 and 14.</p> <p>Data based decision-making resources with probe questions across Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 were included in the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> and provided to staff working with Michigan’s MAPs. These systems of support allowed districts to analyze and improve their performance for all indicators.</p>
2010-2011	<p>2. Provide sustained building-level personnel development using available district/building-level data to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.</p>	<p>Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP), with National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) assistance, held six on-site transition-focus group conversations with intermediate school districts and their transition teams to gather local information and organize this actionable data, utilizing the NSTTAC planning tool.</p> <p>The OSE assisted in the development of the <i>Transition Planning Made Easier</i> and <i>Assessing for Transition</i> online training modules. Targeted assistance to major urban areas consisted of additional training, team support and increased resources for transition coordination roles.</p> <p>Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners and MI-TOP worked with the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability staff and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation high school consultants to provide TA regarding Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14.</p>
2010-2011	<p>3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.</p>	<p>The MRS and the OSE developed an interagency agreement to provide professional development/TA at jointly-sponsored training events.</p> <p>During the MI-TOP conference, transition coordinators received newsletters, guidance documents and informational sessions regarding decision-making during the exit process that impacts student outcomes and district attainment of adequate yearly progress.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 32.6% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 55.6% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 68.0% enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>Actual target data for FFY 2010 are presented on previous pages.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 15 (Compliance Findings) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. For this indicator, the Office of Special Education (OSE) reviewed all findings of noncompliance issued through the state’s monitoring, state complaint, and due process hearing systems during FFY 2009.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Compliance Findings
(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	100%		
2005		100%	100%
2006		100%	90.2%
2007		100%	94.8%
2008		100%	98.8%
2009		100%	93.0%
2010		100%	88.0% *
Percent = [(# of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification) divided by (# of findings of noncompliance)] times 100. * [469 ÷ 533] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan Due Process Database, Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System, and required data from other SPP indicators as referenced in the Indicator B-15 Worksheet.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 15. There was a five percent slippage from the previous year. Following the issuance of the 09-02 memorandum in 2008, Michigan revised its general supervision system to require correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year including verification. Michigan responded to this requirement with intensive training and technical assistance (TA) for the districts, including required participation in face-to-face regional and statewide meetings, web-based trainings, conference calls, electronic messaging and increased enforcement actions for districts not meeting the one year time frame. By FFY 2009, the OSE and districts' understanding of the obligation to correct and verify within a one year time frame had been clarified. Additionally, the electronic capabilities of the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) were redesigned in early 2009 to emphasize and ensure timely correction and verification.

Clarification from OSEP's Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV):

OSEP's March 19, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit letter found when the state verified correction of noncompliance identified in a small number of student records through focused monitoring, the state did not verify that the district was correctly implementing (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated student records, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In FFY 2009, Michigan chose not to make a finding for these instances of student-level noncompliance because the LEAs corrected and the State verified the correction of the individual noncompliance before the State issued written notification of the findings. These instances of noncompliance were not previously included in the Indicator 15 measurement a or b.

As a result of the CIV guidance, Michigan has now revised the number of findings of noncompliance reported for FFY 2009, in measurement a, to include the 78 instances of noncompliance identified in student records through focused monitoring. These data are included in the Indicator B-15 Worksheet below. The Worksheet also includes, in measurement b, the 21 instances of noncompliance for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification.

The State is verifying that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated student records. The State anticipates completing the verification of 57 instances of noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than June 15, 2012. The State will report subsequent correction of the noncompliance in its FFY 2011 APR submission due on February 1, 2013.

Subsequent to the CIV, Michigan: (1) modified and disseminated its procedures to include the review of updated data when findings are issued and a student-level finding is generated to determine whether the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) effective with winter 2012 focused monitoring, is implementing the modified procedures.

INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
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.		0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	2	2	2
4A. Percent of districts identified 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	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	63	63	62
4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	7	13	13

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
(b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.				
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	15	15	15
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	13	13	13
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	87	87	86
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	8	10	10
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	38	38	36
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	29	29	29
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Other areas of noncompliance: Evaluation Process	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	19	21	7
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	20	25	25
Other areas of noncompliance: Independent Educational Evaluation	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	3	4	4
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Development	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data	40	42	13

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
	Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	29	40	38
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Implementation	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	4	4	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	44	85	84
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Participation	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	9	10	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	7	10	10
Other areas of noncompliance: Notice Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	6	8	8
Other areas of noncompliance: Previous Enrollment in Special Education	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	1	1	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	8	8	8
Other areas of noncompliance: Teacher Certification	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	2	2	2

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
Other areas of noncompliance: Confidentiality	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	3	3	3
The worksheet automatically sums Column a and b			533	469
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification =				88%

Sources: Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan State Complaint Database, monitoring data from the CIMS, and required data from other SPP indicators as referenced in the Indicator B-15 Worksheet.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	1. Review data from the State Complaint Database for timeliness, issues and trends within intermediate school districts (ISDs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) for supervision decisions regarding monitoring, compliance agreements or verification.	The Program Accountability Unit's staff reviewed the State Complaint and Due Process data for issues and trends within LEAs and ISDs. The data collection system continues to be updated as additional data elements and capabilities were required. In addition, a new data system is being designed to better align with the current complaint and due process systems. The Program Accountability staff participated in the OSE monthly conference calls with the ISD monitors from across the state and with the Program Accountability Advisory Team to ensure a consistent flow of information regarding procedural issues.
2006-2011	2. Conduct annual analysis of state performance through the APR and utilize results to	The annual analysis was conducted and priority areas of disproportionate representation, suspension/expulsion and educational environments were selected

Timelines	Activities	Status
	determine priority areas for focused monitoring for the ensuing year.	and used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
2006-2011	3. Conduct an annual analysis of LEA data and utilize results to determine priority LEAs and make determinations for focused monitoring.	The analysis of these priority areas was conducted and used to select districts for focused monitoring activities.
2006-2011 annually	4. Continue full implementation of the CIMS at the LEA level.	The CIMS process continued to be fully implemented in accordance with the process outlined in Appendix A.
2007-2011	5. Disaggregate transition, disproportionate representation and Child Find data.	The OSE disaggregated and reviewed district level data related to early childhood and secondary transition, disproportionate representation and Child Find.
2010-2011	6. Conduct interviews to identify risk factors and effective strategies that may impact timely correction of noncompliance.	Interviews of lead and ISD monitors and TA providers were conducted. These interviews led to the development of the TA Notes feature in the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> , which allowed TA providers to maintain a log of the support provided to local districts and the effectiveness of the TA. A calendar feature included reminders of due dates to impact timely completion of corrective action activities and verification of correction.
2010-2011	7. Enhance the electronic function of the CIMS to include focused monitoring activities, TA activities, enforcement activities and the tracking of the correction of noncompliance.	A Focused Monitoring Module was developed and launched in the <i>CIMS Workbook</i> . The Module included student lists, data reports, student record review forms, templates for the preliminary summaries and final reports, and student-level corrective action plans (CAPs). It also allowed for tracking of monitoring, TA and enforcement activities related to correction of noncompliance.

Correction of FFY 2009 Noncompliance:

Of the 533 findings issued during FFY 2009, 469 were corrected within one year. The table below provides the current status for each of the seven findings that the state verified as corrected beyond the one year timeline.

Verification of correction occurs within one year of notification of the noncompliance and includes the two prongs as required by the OSEP.

For prong one (the local has corrected each individual case of noncompliance), verification activities may include a review of new data submitted to the OSE or student records.

For prong two (the local is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements), verification activities may include:

1. Review of updated policies, procedures or practices.
2. A review of evidence that professional development or TA was provided.
3. Interviews of district staff and other stakeholders.
4. Review of additional student records.

Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010)	533
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	469
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	64

FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	64
5. Number of FFY 2009 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	7
6. Number of FFY 2009 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	57

FFY 2009 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
1	4A/B	1	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> (IDEA) regulations.	<p>Finding issued: May 15, 2010, as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of a progress report. State supervision and TA providers were assigned. The status of the correction of this noncompliance was included in monthly meetings and conference calls.</p> <p>Status: Verified as corrected by TA providers and closed by the OSE on June 30, 2011.</p>
2	11	2	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2010, based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The district implemented all activities of the CAP but the district's data was not 100 percent compliant. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on November 3, 2011.</p>
3	12	3	The district did not conduct all early childhood transition IEPs in a timely manner.	<p>Finding Issued: December 15, 2009, based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The district implemented all activities of the CAP but the district's data was not 100 percent compliant. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved.</p>

FFY 2009 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on February 18, 2011.
4	12	4	The district did not conduct all early childhood transition IEPs in a timely manner.	<p>Finding Issued: December 15, 2009, based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The district implemented all activities of the CAP but the district's data was not 100 percent compliant. Additional data reviews were conducted until 100 percent compliance was achieved.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on February 16, 2011.</p>
5, 6, 7	Other areas of non-compliance: IEP Implementation and IEP Development	5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District revised the IEP outside of an IEP team meeting. 2. District offered an IEP that did not comply with Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education. 3. Supplementary aids and services were not provided per the IEP. 	<p>Finding Issued: October 7, 2009, through the state complaint process.</p> <p>The OSE notified the district on October 7, 2009, to implement specific corrective actions by December 18, 2009.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: On December 9, 2009, the district submitted partial proof of compliance and requested additional time to complete the compensatory education plan with the parents. When the district and the parents were unable to develop a plan, the OSE consulted with the parents and on March 31, 2010, the OSE directed compensatory education. On April 6, 2010, the compensatory education was redirected. Because of multiple student hospitalizations, a family move and a subsequent change in educational providers the OSE allowed additional time to complete the compensatory</p>

FFY 2009 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>education.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on November 21, 2011.</p>

FFY 2008 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
2	4A	8	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009, as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and provided TA. As a result, the district revised its policies and procedures for suspension/expulsion, provided evidence of ensuring provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and provided professional development on these activities within a year of issuing the findings of noncompliance. However, student record reviews did not indicate full compliance.</p> <p>The OSE increased state supervision including subsequent student record reviews and site visits conducted in collaboration with the ISD on June 7, October 20 and December 6 of 2010, and January 5, March 28, June 7, June 9, and August 26 of 2011. The district offered compensatory education to 46 students and provided educational services to all students who accepted the district's offer.</p> <p>Status: Verified as compliant by the TA provider and closed by the OSE on October 6, 2011.</p>
3	4A	29	The district's	Finding Issued: April 15, 2009, as a

FFY 2008 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and provided TA. As a result, the district developed a process to conduct Manifestation Determination Reviews if a pattern of removals exists or students are suspended for more than ten consecutive days, ensuring the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and provided professional development on these activities within a year of issuing the findings of noncompliance. Student record reviews did not indicate 100 percent compliance.</p> <p>The OSE increased state supervision including subsequent student record reviews and site visits conducted in collaboration with the ISD on September 21, 27, October 6, 14, and December 13 of 2010, and January 6, May 18, and June 14 of 2011, found continued noncompliance. The district employed a full-time special education director in January 2011. Additional professional development was provided and interviews conducted with the district administrators and additional student record reviews were conducted to ensure full compliance.</p> <p>Status: Verified as compliant by the TA providers and closed by the OSE on June 30, 2011.</p>
6	5	16	The district did not provide the services outlined in the IEP.	<p>Finding Issued: July 2, 2009, through the state complaint process.</p> <p>The OSE notified the district on July 2, 2009, to implement specific corrective actions by May 31, 2010.</p>

FFY 2008 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>Summary of Activities: The family moved out of the district shortly after the directive for corrective action was issued. When the family notified the OSE of their new address and contact information, the OSE extended the corrective action timeline to July 31, 2010. When this deadline was not met, the OSE provided intensified oversight regarding the provision of the required compensatory services. Monthly status updates were provided until the noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>Status: Verified as compliant by the complaint case manager and closed by the OSE on May 24, 2011.</p>
7	5	16	The district did not provide students with IEPs access to the general education classroom or curriculum.	<p>Finding Issued: August 23, 2008, as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root case analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and TA were provided.</p> <p>The OSE holds monthly meetings and conference calls, and makes on-site visits to bring the district into compliance. Participants in the meetings and conference calls include personnel from the district, the ISD, the Michigan Department of Education, the OSE and the U.S. Department of Education regarding the district's high risk status and continued noncompliance.</p> <p>In addition, 20 percent of the district's IDEA funds were held by the ISD. Release of these funds was dependent on the completion of the activities specified in the CAP.</p> <p>All evidence of correction has been</p>

FFY 2008 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>submitted including a revised procedural manual, an inclusion plan, evidence of an increase in the number of less restrictive placements, evidence of professional development activities, and revision of data entry standards.</p> <p>Status: Verified as compliant by the TA providers and closed by the OSE on June 30, 2011.</p>
24	11	16	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008, based on the OSE data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE also required participation in Child Find training, TA and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process (RAP) team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010. This was due on January 14, 2011, and data were not at 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Increased state supervision continues and professional development for all staff involved in evaluation was conducted. New data was reviewed on January 14, May 9 and June 22, 2011.</p> <p>Status: Verified as compliant through data reviews and completion of the CAP on June 23, 2011. Closed on June 29, 2011.</p>
70-74	11	7 Closed	The district did	Findings Issued: April 15, 2009,

FFY 2008 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
		3/16/11, 16 Closed 6/29/11, 38 Closed 1/26/11, 55 Closed 1/26/11, 56 Closed 1/26/11	not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>based on an OSE data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE required participation in Child Find training, TA, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Convene a RAP team of staff members involved in initial evaluations and IEPs. 2. Review the Indicator 11 Child Find data submitted by the local in June 2011 through the Michigan Student Data System. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discuss the specific students whose initial IEPs were not timely b. Determine the specific nature of the delays and c. Develop a plan of correction. <p>A data log was required to show evidence of correction for the period of September 7, 2010, and November 15, 2010, and due on January 14, 2011. The OSE verified the data. If the data were not 100 percent compliant, the district was required to repeat the above activities and submit a subsequent data log until compliance was achieved.</p> <p>Status: Verified and closed by the OSE on the dates indicated in column 3.</p>
85	Other: FAPE ⁵³	49	Programs and services outlined in the IEP did not constitute FAPE.	Order of correction issued: February 2, 2009, following the adjudication of a Due Process Hearing. The Administrative Law Judge’s decision was appealed to the federal district court. The student’s placement is on stay-put and the order cannot be

⁵³ Free Appropriate Public Education

FFY 2008 Correction of Noncompliance				
Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>implemented until the court renders its decision.</p> <p>The federal district court rendered a decision that was subsequently appealed to the 6th Circuit Court. The student continues in a stay-put placement.</p>

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 98.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%. The State reported that 1,127 of 1,212 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 74 findings were subsequently corrected by January 18, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were 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 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific</p>	<p>Of the 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR, ten were corrected and one is pending a court decision. Michigan verified that each district with noncompliance findings (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet. In responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>	<p>The improvement activities were reviewed and revision was not needed to ensure timely correction of noncompliance identified by Michigan in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and the OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Of the seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, all seven findings (within five districts) were verified that they were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • correctly implemented the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a state data system • corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02. The correction of noncompliance for Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 is described in each indicator report in the FFY 2010 APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 16 (State Complaints) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In FFY 2010, the percentage of state complaints that were resolved and withdrawn by complainants doubled compared to years before the single tier state complaint procedures were implemented. The Office of Special Education (OSE) attributed this to single-tier complaint procedures that encouraged alternative dispute resolution including:
 - Provided time at the beginning of the process and encouraged the parties to meet and attempt to resolve the matter.
 - Interaction with districts that acknowledge noncompliance.
 - Enhanced collaboration between the OSE and the intermediate school district investigators and the three-way and four-way communication with complainants and district.
 - Procedures allowing the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) to refer complaints to the Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) when the complaint is filed.
3. During 2010, additional revisions to the state complaint procedures were implemented.
4. The OSE continues the development of a new database to improve the tracking of state complaints and integration of data from state complaints, due process complaints and mediation.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/State Complaints

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	100%		
2005		100%	99.0%
2006		100%	99.2%
2007		100%	100%
2008		100%	96.7%
2009		100%	99.2%
2010		100%	99.3%*
Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.			
*[(121 + 19) ÷ 141] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Due Process Database and Michigan Hearings Database

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 16. In FFY 2010, 141 complaints resulted in written reports issued. Of these, 140 were completed within the timelines or extended timelines. This resulted in an increase of 0.1 percent from FFY 2009.

Analysis of Complaint Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010

	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
(1) Total number of written, signed complaints filed	204	199
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	133	141
(a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	79	95
(b) Reports within timeline	117	121
(c) Reports with extended timelines	15	19
(1.2) Complaints pending	1	2
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	70	56

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2009-2011	1. Continued training of all stakeholders regarding implementation of single-tier complaint system.	The OSE completed this activity.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2009-2011	2. Expand database to integrate information across due process, monitoring, mediation and state complaint data sets.	Expansion activities continued throughout FFY 2010. The OSE continued collaboration with the Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget to develop a new database. The budget was approved. The needs assessment and requirements phase of the process was completed and the company that will build the system was selected.
2009-2011	3. Improve database to track single-tier complaints.	Multiple updates and improvements to the existing database were made throughout the year.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2008-2011	4. Develop and implement a plan for ongoing maintenance and continuous improvement of the system.	The OSE Program Accountability (PA) Unit conducted the annual review and revision of the State Complaint Procedures and Administrative Rules to improve implementation of the single-tier state complaint system. A plan was established to review procedures and rules twice per year. Proposed revisions to the model state complaint form and procedures were presented for public comment/ hearings in February through April 2011.
2008-2011	5. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators. • Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant. • Michigan’s emerging 	The OSE PA Unit met every six weeks to review, revise and develop policies and procedures relevant to the general supervision indicators. FFY 2010 activities included development and revision of guidance documents for districts regarding discipline, private school placement, evaluation and reevaluation procedures, as well as notice and consent and monitoring

Timelines	Activities	Status
	work with the NCSEAM ⁵⁴ General Supervision Framework.	standards. The OSE collaborated with the Center for Educational Networking in development and dissemination of these guidance documents and supporting materials relative to the single-tier complaint system.
2009-2011	6. Make changes to administrative rules and procedures necessary to implement the single-tier complaint system.	Revisions to the state complaints procedures were identified and presented to stakeholders for public comment and hearings in February through April 2011.
2009-2011	7. Evaluate the effectiveness/impact of the single tier complaint system, and use evaluation results for continuous improvement of the system.	Review of the data indicates areas of improvement attributable to portions of the single-tier process including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of complaints resolved without investigation. • District acknowledgement of noncompliance prior to investigation. • Percent of complaints completed within the timeline or an extended timeline for exceptional circumstances. • State Complaint Procedures and the MDE model state complaint form allowed the MDE to refer the complainant to the MSEMP when the complaint was filed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

⁵⁴ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will result in the state becoming compliant.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 17 (Hearings Adjudicated) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Pursuant to an executive order, hearings are conducted by administrative law judges (ALJs) who are hired and supervised by the Michigan Administrative Hearings System (MAHS), previously known as the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules.
3. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the MAHS communicated regularly to review and revise procedures to ensure compliance with timeline requirements.
4. The MDE and the MAHS collaborated for ALJ training in FFY 2010.
5. Changes were made to the due process complaint system that included additions to the database and the ALJ Summary Report form, as well as revisions to the state administrative rules and procedures, which were promulgated and became effective in December 2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Hearings Adjudicated
(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	100%		
2005		100%	100%
2006		100%	83.3%
2007		100%	75.0%
2008		100%	83.3%
2009		100%	100%
2010		100%	50.0% *
Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100. *[(1 + 1) ÷ 4] X 100			

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 17. Two of the four hearings were completed in time. Two were not completed in time due to a two-day delay in mailing after the federally required timeline.

Analysis of Due Process Hearing Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010

	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
(3) Hearing requests total ⁵⁵	65	67
(3.1) Resolution sessions (Percent of total hearing requests)	54 (83.1%)	51 (76.1%)
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated (Percent of total hearing requests)	5 (7.7%)	4 (5.9%)
(a) Decisions within timeline (Percent of fully adjudicated hearings)	3 (60.0%)	1 (25.0%)
(b) Decisions within extended timeline (Percent of fully adjudicated hearings)	2 (40.0%)	1 (25.0%)
(3.2)(a) + (3.2)(b) (Percent of fully adjudicated hearings that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.)	5 (100%)	2 (50.0%)
(3.4) Resolved without a hearing (Percent of closed complaints)	43* (89.6%)	47* (92.2%)
(4) Total number of expedited hearings filed (Percent of total hearing requests)	18 (27.7%)	15 (22.4%)
(3.3) Due process complaints pending	17	16

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

- *67 (hearing requests) minus 16 (hearing requests pending) = 51 concluded hearing requests
- 51 (concluded hearing requests) minus 4 (fully adjudicated hearings) = 47 hearing requests resolved without a hearing
- 47 of the 51 concluded hearing requests were resolved without a hearing = 92.2 percent

⁵⁵ Parents now file a "due process complaint" per *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) language, which is synonymous with Hearing Requests as referenced in this SPP Indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	1. Provide ongoing selection, training and evaluation of ALJs to assure continuing compliance with timeline requirements through efforts of MAHS staff through the collaboration between the MDE and the MAHS.	The MDE continued collaboration with the MAHS for ALJ training. In addition, the MDE and the MAHS met regularly to discuss revisions to procedures to ensure compliance with timeline requirements.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	2. Develop common expectations for diligent and prompt attention to completion of due process hearing activities among hearing officers, hearing participants and stakeholders.	New Due Process Complaint Procedures and Administrative Rules were promulgated with input from stakeholders. Public hearings and comments relative to these procedures and rules were conducted in February through April 2011.
2007-2011	3. Revise the role and responsibilities of the MDE Due Process Complaint Coordinator as needed.	No revisions were needed for FFY 2010.
2007-2011	4. Review the Interdepartmental Agreement between the MAHS and the Office of Special Education (OSE); revise the role and responsibilities of the parties as needed.	The MDE and the MAHS met as needed to discuss changes to procedures, especially pertaining to development of the new database.
2008-2011	5. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators • Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant, • Michigan’s emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	<p>The OSE Program Accountability (PA) Unit met monthly to develop policies and procedures relevant to the general supervision indicators. The OSE PA Unit met routinely to develop a new framework for investigation/response to systemic complaints that includes collaboration with state complaints, due process hearings and monitoring staff.</p> <p>The OSE PA Unit met with the Monitoring Advisory Team (MAT), throughout FFY 2010. The MAT provided valuable input regarding proposed revisions to rules and procedures. The OSE collaborated</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		with the Center for Educational Networking and Michigan Special Education Mediation Program to develop additional documents, forms and training/information dissemination strategies for stakeholders.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2006-2011	6. Provide increased opportunities for stakeholders' participation in policy, rules and procedures revisions.	Stakeholder participation occurred through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Special Education Advisory Committee⁵⁶ • Public Comment/Hearings • Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education⁵⁷ meetings • Intermediate school district (ISD) director meetings • ISD monitor meetings • MAT meetings
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2006-2011	7. Disseminate a due process complaint procedures document to reflect new single tier due process complaint system and IDEA Regulations.	Proposed revisions to the State Complaint Procedures were presented for public comment/hearings in February through April 2011.
2007-2011	8. Create and disseminate a Michigan special education due process frequently asked questions document.	The frequently asked questions document was not needed due to the revised format of the Procedures document.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

⁵⁶ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel

⁵⁷ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council of Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 Response Table.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 18 (Resolution Session Agreements) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. New procedures were implemented to track resolution sessions conducted and those that resulted in settlement agreements.
 - A letter is sent to the parent, and copied to the district when a due process complaint is filed. A page is included that provides an explanation of the resolution session process, requirements and expectations.
 - An e-mail is sent to the district special education director and superintendent after the complaint is filed. The e-mail informs the district of the requirement and timeline to conduct the resolution session; the requirement to report the results to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE); and a form to use to report the results of the resolution session.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Resolution Session Agreements (Results Indicator)

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	36.4%		
2006		36.0%	45.3%
2007		37.0%	64.3%
2008		38.0%	46.6%
2009		40.0%	46.3%
2010		42.0%	64.7%*
Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100. ⁵⁸			
*(33 ÷ 51) x 100			

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

⁵⁸ See the Analysis of Hearing Request Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010 table on the next page.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan met the FFY 2010 target of 42 percent for Indicator 18. The percentage of resolution sessions conducted decreased seven percent (from 83.1 percent in FFY 2009 to 76.1 percent in FFY 2010). However, 14 of the complaints filed did not require a resolution session because:

- Parties waived the resolution session or went to mediation.
- The district was the complainant.
- Complainant withdrew the complaint or the complaint was dismissed by the administrative law judge before the resolution period elapsed.

Of the 51 resolution sessions that were conducted in FFY 2010, 64.7 percent resulted in a resolution session agreement. This is a 21.4 percent increase from last year. The Office of Special Education attributes this increase to the activities noted in the Overview of Indicator 18, item two.

Analysis of Hearing Request Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010

	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
(3) Total Hearing requests ⁵⁹	65	67
(3.1) Resolution sessions (Percent of total hearing requests)	54 (83.1%)	51 (76.1%)
(a) Number of resolution session settlement agreements (Percent of resolution sessions)	25 (46.3%)	33 (64.7%)

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2010-2011	1. Improve monitoring of district compliance with requirements for resolution sessions including reporting mechanism.	Procedures were implemented in December 2010 to improve reporting and tracking of resolution sessions.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2011	2. Review Interdepartmental Agreement (IA) between the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules, now known as the Michigan Administrative Hearings System (MAHS), and the MDE; revise the roles and responsibilities of the parties as needed.	Extensive review and revision of the IA began in spring and summer of 2011 regarding the implications of a new database on the collaboration between the MDE and the MAHS.

⁵⁹ Parents now file a "due process complaint" per *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* language, which is synonymous with Hearing Requests as referenced in this indicator.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2008-2011	3. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators • Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant • Michigan’s emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	The Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) continued to provide mediation and alternative dispute resolution services. During FFY 2010, the MSEMP continued to expand services for resolution session facilitation.
2009-2011	4. Develop policies and procedures to implement new administrative rules as they relate to alternative dispute resolution and resolution sessions.	New due process complaint/procedures were promulgated during FFY 2010, which became effective in December 2010. These procedures include requirements for districts to submit reports relative to resolution sessions.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2009-2011	5. Provide technical assistance (TA) regarding new administrative rules and regulations as they relate to “Resolution Sessions” and “Resolution Session Settlement Agreements.”	Training and TA was provided at the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education ⁶⁰ Summer Institute and the Michigan Council for Exceptional Children annual conference.
2009-2011	6. Continue to monitor and evaluate the implementation of resolution session activities to date. Revise in accordance with performance data.	Informal discussions were conducted with multiple stakeholders regarding improving the percentage of resolution sessions conducted and settlement agreements developed. Participants included Program Accountability Advisory Team members, parents and their advocates/attorneys, the Michigan Protection and Advocacy Service, Inc., and district administrators and their attorneys. New procedures were

⁶⁰ Michigan’s state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children

Timelines	Activities	Status
		implemented to track resolution sessions conducted and those that resulted in settlement agreements.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 46.3%. The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator were 46.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 40%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 the OSEP Response Table.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Overview of Indicator 19 (Mediation Agreements) Report Development:

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. For this indicator, the Office of Special Education (OSE) used data from the Michigan Mediation Database. The improvement activities continue to focus on the elements necessary to increase the use of mediation throughout the state in order to help parents and educators avoid or resolve conflict relative to special education programs/services.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Mediation Agreements
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	72.7%		
2005		74.0%	87.7%
2006		75.0%	80.4%
2007		76.0%	80.4%
2008		77.0%	78.8%
2009		78.5%	84.5%
2010		80.0%	77.4%*
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.			
*[(7 + 65) ÷ 93] X 100			

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet the FFY 2010 target of 80 percent for Indicator 19. This agreement rate of 77.4 percent represents a slippage from the 84.5 percent agreement rate posted in FFY 2009. During the year, the OSE introduced new procedures to improve access to mediation in complaint-related cases. The result was an influx of more difficult cases to the Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP).

Mediation requests for FFY 2010 totaled 145 and the total number of mediations conducted was 93. Seventy-two cases reached agreement. In order to provide a continuum of mediation services, Michigan facilitated 60 individualized education program (IEP) team meetings and two resolution sessions in FFY 2010.

Analysis of Mediation Data for FFY 2009 – FFY 2010

	FFY 2009	FFY 2010
(2.1) Mediations held	84	93
(a)(i) Mediations agreements related to due process complaints that resulted in complete agreement (Percent of mediations held)	1 (1.2%)	7 (7.5%)
(b)(i) Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints that resulted in complete agreement (Percent of mediations held)	70 (83.3%)	65 (69.8%)
(2.1)(a)(i) + (2.1)(b)(i) (Percent of mediations held)	71 (84.5%)	72 (77.4%)

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	1. Build capacity of parents and educators to maximize the use of mediation through skill-building workshops.	The MSEMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted presentations throughout Michigan to introduce parents and educators to the program. Conducted a series of workshops for parents statewide in conjunction with the Michigan Alliance for Families⁶¹ and the Michigan Family-to-Family Health Information and Education Center. A training video demonstrating mediation was posted to the MSEMP website.

⁶¹ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSEMP began the production of a web-based training video demonstrating IEP facilitation.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2006-2011	2. Use the new compliance database to increase opportunities for use of mediation and track progress in mediation.	The new database is under development.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	3. Explore feasibility of providing targeted technical assistance (TA) in high complaint districts.	Feasibility was demonstrated when self-selected intermediate school districts (ISDs) requested training from the MSEMP due to a high number of complaints or the existence of adversarial relations between schools and parents in specific school districts. These trainings were conducted in those ISDs from FFY 2007 through FFY 2009.
2006-2011	4. Increase coordination with the OSE complaint and hearing staff.	The MSEMP and the OSE developed procedures for referring due process and state complaints to the MSEMP.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	5. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general supervision SPP indicators Michigan’s Mandated Activities Projects⁶² (MAPs) Michigan’s emerging work with the NCSEAM⁶³ General Supervision Framework 	As one of the MAPs, the MSEMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in management and Parent Involvement community learning sessions and leadership meetings. Explored the potential impact of mediation center work in restorative justice on Indicators 2 (Dropout), 4A (Suspension/ Expulsion) and 11 (Child Find). Coordinated trainings with Michigan Alliance for Families and attended their strategic design meetings.

⁶² Michigan’s state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* administrative set-aside funds

⁶³ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	6. Research and introduce new collaborative problem-solving techniques for use in mediation.	The MSEMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed recent research on conflict resolution skills development and teamwork in special education. • Conducted research in dialogue, parent-teacher communication and collaborative techniques for breaking deadlocks. • Developed a plan for the introduction of problem-solving techniques.
2006-2011	7. Improve mediator trainings held to emphasize techniques for reaching agreements.	The MSEMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posted a section to the MSEMP website that provides access to the OSE, the OSEP and MSEMP procedural, guidance and training materials related to dispute resolution for mediators. • Identified the content for advanced trainings for mediators.
2006-2011	8. Increase the use of IEP facilitation.	Since 2004, the number of facilitated IEP meetings has increased. In FFY 2010, 60 facilitated IEP meetings were conducted.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2007-2011	9. Implement statewide proposed OSE dispute resolution policy (when approved) encouraging early collaborative dispute resolution before and after the filing of a state complaint.	The MSEMP implemented a component of this activity by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating in the OSE training on the new referral procedures (See Activity #4 above). • Incorporating information regarding the new referral procedures into presentations and workshops. • Training intake personnel on the new referral procedures.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2007-2011	10. Publish a newsletter to highlight MSEMP services and proposed policies at the Michigan Department of Education.	A newsletter was published highlighting the new complaint referral procedures.
2008-2011	11. Provide TA on continuum of dispute resolution alternatives.	The OSE helpline continued to provide general program information and referral services.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>The MSEMP intake staff were trained to describe dispute resolution options and program services to callers.</p> <p>Guidance was provided to the MSEMP service centers regarding policy and procedures.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 84.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 78.8%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 78.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2009 the OSEP Response Table.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**Overview of Indicator 20 (Timely and Accurate Data) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education (OSE) Performance Reporting Unit and grantees from Wayne State University, Public Sector Consultants, and Interagency Information Systems (IIS) reviewed data submitted in the FFY 2010 APR, § 618 data, and ED*Facts* data submitted on February 1, 2011, November 1, 2011 and December 15, 2011, to measure the extent to which all reported data were timely, complete and passed edit checks. They also:
 - Provided explanations of year-to-year changes requested by the Data Accountability Center (DAC) on behalf of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).
 - Reviewed all formulae and instructions provided by the OSEP to assure that they were followed.
3. To meet new reporting requirements, the OSE representatives participated in technical assistance (TA) calls conducted by the OSEP, North Central Regional Resource Center, and the Council of Chief State School Officers/Education Information Management Advisory Consortium. Staff also reviewed the DAC/OSEP listserv messages and responded to requests from the DAC/OSEP to review and/or explain significant year-to-year data changes.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Timely and Accurate Data

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 20: State reported data (Section 618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
100 percent of state reported data (618 Tables and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005 (2005-2006)	90.0%		
2006 (2006-2007) through 2008 (2008-2009)		100%	100%
2009 (2009-2010)		100%	92.86%
2010 (2010-2011)		100%	98.83%

Sources: Michigan Due Process Database, Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan Mediation Database, Single Record Student Database, Michigan Student Data System, Michigan Compliance Information System, Registry of Educational Personnel, Michigan Educational Assessment System, the OSE Financial Database.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:

Michigan did not meet the FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 20 for timely and accurate data.

Between FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, Michigan maintained 100 percent compliance for timely data reporting and made progress in reporting accurate data. In FFY 2009, Michigan received a 92.86 percent for timely and accurate data reporting due to inadvertently miscoding some data reported via *EDFacts*. Specifically, when reporting data through *EDFacts* on Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age (File N002) and Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood (File N089), zeros (0s) were reported in some cells, when the cells should have been left blank to indicate that Michigan does not collect these data.

Based on input from the DAC, Michigan assessed and revised its business rules for reporting data via *EDFacts* in 2010. In FFY 2010, Michigan received a 98.83 percent for timely and accurate data reporting due to discrepancies in data reported for Indicator 15 (General Supervision System) in the FFY 2010 APR and the Indicator 15 Worksheet. The OSEP conducted a CIV the week of November 28, 2011 and the OSE received a letter on March 19, 2012 informing Michigan of the results of the visit. The OSEP reported that Michigan did not verify that some districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, so Michigan should have excluded from measurement (b) of Indicator 15 the number of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for which correction was not verified consistent with requirements of OSEP Memorandum 09-02. It should be noted that the FFY 2010 APR submitted February 1, 2012 did not include any of the findings of noncompliance identified during the CIV for FFY 2009 for which correction was not verified in measurement (b).

For more information, reference FFY 2010 APR Indicator 15.

Data

For FFY 2010, Michigan was conditionally approved for “EDEN-only” status with respect to its assessment data. Small discrepancies between data reported via *EDFacts* and the Data Analysis System were investigated and the OSE worked closely with the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability to resolve them. As a result, Michigan’s assessment data submissions were deemed sufficiently congruent to enable Michigan to become *EDFacts* only for reporting FFY 2010 assessment data for students with individualized education programs (IEPs).

Michigan continued to employ data verification protocols for Indicators 4A (Suspension/Expulsion), 4B (Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity) and 11 (Child Find) data within the Michigan Student Data System. Districts that reported data constituting less than one percent (<1%) of their total number of students with IEPs were asked to verify their data. Districts that reported either initial IEPs or discipline data constituting 25 percent or more of their total number of students with IEPs were also asked to verify their data. For initial IEPs, districts that reported incorrect data had an opportunity to request deletion of incorrect data. These districts were required to submit an official letter from their superintendent requesting changes, and provide an explanation for the errors, along with a description of processes employed to ensure the same type of errors do not occur in the future. For other indicators data verification was done by the OSE staff, contractors, and other state offices.

The data advisory committee continued to advise the OSE on coordinated and strategic special education regarding:

- Data collection —Optimize the ease and accuracy of special education data submitted, via clarity in programming and technical manual language, thus reducing the data burden on all parties.
- Data verification —Confirm the accuracy of submitted data, amending as needed, and adjusting protocols to avoid continuing error patterns.
- Data reporting —Report data to the U.S. Department of Education, districts, the public and state of Michigan colleagues.
- Data analysis and use —Enhance the quality/impact of services for Michigan’s students with IEPs.

The data advisory committee is comprised of district and state agency personnel who have knowledge and experience in performing and improving data collections, verifications and reporting. The committee provides a forum for the OSE to collaborate with district personnel on data initiatives such as data verification efforts. Such collaboration has resulted in more accurate and complete data reported by districts.

Actual FFY 2010 Data:

Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric

State Performance Plan (SPP)/APR Data - Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	0	1	1
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	39
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2010 APR was submitted on time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		44.00

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Diagram	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 12/15/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 8 - MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/1/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
				Subtotal	20
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.045) =		40.91
Indicator #20 Calculation					
A. APR Grand Total					44.00
B. 618 Grand Total					40.91
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =					84.91
Total N/A in APR					0
Total N/A in 618					4.0908
Base					85.91
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =					0.988
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =					98.83

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.143 for 618

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed:

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2005-2011	1. Enforce submission deadlines.	The OSE enforced submission deadlines through district determinations and by informing all districts in memos and at conferences and organization meetings that districts not meeting submission deadlines would be subject to sanctions.
2005-2011	2. Continue to distribute widely, teach about, and use the District Data Portraits.	District Data Portraits continued to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A primary mechanism for assessing and improving data quality. The OSE and IIS continued to use District Data Portraits as a teaching tool with districts by demonstrating how to review and identify data inaccuracies. • Distributed at conferences and organization meetings so that districts could examine their data in order to address potential problems. • Used by state and intermediate school district monitors as a data source for focused monitoring activities. • Used by the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System local review and analysis process teams for developing improvement activities.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2005-2011	3. Continue implementation of internal process that ensures timely reporting.	To ensure timely reporting of all § 618 data tables, SPP and APR data, the OSE evaluated and updated business rules. The business rules delineate the tasks to be performed, who will perform them and when they will be completed.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	4. Continue working with data personnel from Detroit Public Schools and other districts as necessary to improve the accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	The work consisted of a variety of methods to assess and verify data accuracy and timeliness issues with Detroit Public Schools and other districts with difficulties providing accurate and timely data through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performed quality checks of submitted data to identify common

Timelines	Activities	Status
		errors in reporting accurate and complete data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided TA to target these common errors and provide guidance on how to correctly report problematic data elements, i.e., data fields. • Monitored districts that have had problems with reporting accurate data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2011-2013	<i>Revision of Activity #3:</i> Implement internal processes and revise business rules to ensure timely and accurate data reporting.	Due to the OSEP’s calculation of the accuracy of data reported, the OSE needed to enhance its review process. New internal processes were developed and are being implemented as a result of this process.

Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness and 92.86% for accuracy. However, OSEP’s calculation of the data for this indicator is 92.86%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.	The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.	Improvement activities were reviewed and revised to ensure compliance in timely and accurate data reporting. In reporting on Indicator 20, Michigan used the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

Acronyms Used in the APR

AA-AAS	Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards
AA-MAS	Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards
ALJ	Administrative Law Judge
APR	Annual Performance Report
ARR	Alternate Risk Ratio
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
BAA	Bureau of Assessment and Accountability
CADRE	Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CAST	Center for Applied Special Technology
CEN	Center for Educational Networking
CEPI	Center for Educational Performance and Information
CIMS	Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System
COP	Community of Practice
DAC	Data Accountability Center
ECE&FS	Early Childhood Education & Family Services
ECO	Early Childhood Outcomes
EIMAC	Education Information Management Advisory Consortium
ELPA	English Language Proficiency Assessment
EOT&TA	<i>Early On</i> [®] Training and Technical Assistance Grant
ESA	Educational Service Agencies
ESEA	<i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</i>
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
GSEG	General Supervision Enhancement Grant
IA	Interdepartmental Agreement
IDEA	<i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IIS	Interagency Information Systems
ISD	Intermediate School District
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MAHS	Michigan Administrative Hearing System
MAPs	Mandated Activities Projects
MAR	Monitoring Activities Report
MARSE	Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education
MAT	Monitoring Advisory Team
MDE	Michigan Department of Education
MEAP	Michigan Educational Assessment Program
MiBLSi	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative
MI-CIS	Michigan Compliance Information System
MI-TOP	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project
MRS	Michigan Rehabilitation Services
MSDS	Michigan Student Data System
MSEMP	Michigan Special Education Mediation Program
NASDSE	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
NCRRC	North Central Regional Resource Center
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring

NDPC	National Dropout Prevention Center
NDPC-SD	National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities
NECTAC	National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
NICHCY	National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities
NIMAS	National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard
NPSO	National Post School Outcomes Center
NSTTAC	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center
OEII	Office of Education Improvement and Innovation
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OSE	Office of Special Education
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
PA	Program Accountability
Part B	Part B of IDEA
Part C	Part C of IDEA
PBIS	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
PSA	Public School Academy (aka Charter School)
PTI	Parent Training and Information Center
RAP	Review Analysis Process
RR	Risk Ratio
RTSL	Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners
RtI	Response to Intervention
SEAC	Special Education Advisory Committee, Part B State Advisory Panel
SISEP	State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center
SPP	State Performance Plan
USED	United States Department of Education
WRR	Weighted Risk Ratio
WSU	Wayne State University

FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report

Appendix A:

Overview of the

Continuous Improvement and

Monitoring System

As Developed and Implemented in Michigan

Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System

OVERVIEW

The Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) is the monitoring system used by the Michigan Department of Education, the Offices of Special Education (OSE) and the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services. The state uses this system to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* and promote positive student outcomes.

The CIMS was designed to help the state and its locals⁶⁴ analyze and interpret data as well as record all monitoring activities in a single location. The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA and the State Performance Plan (SPP), and aligns with the Michigan School Improvement Framework.

In assessing the performance of its locals, the OSE monitors data collected through:

- Focused monitoring activities (on-site, state-verified desk audit or state-verified self-review)
- Complaints
- Data reviews
- Due process hearings
- Local performance plans
- Other activities

Michigan evaluates the performance of each local, relative to the SPP indicator targets. If areas of noncompliance with the IDEA or state rules are identified, the state must issue a finding of noncompliance to the local. The finding is a dated, written notification which explains the area of noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute, rule or regulation related to the noncompliance and a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, and verified by the state within that year.

During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010, the electronic *CIMS Workbooks* were launched on August 15, 2010, December 15, 2010 and April 15, 2011.

Elements of the CIMS Process

The CIMS processes and tools include the following:

Electronic Workbooks

Electronic workbooks help locals organize information and activities related to the monitoring process. Each local is issued a *CIMS Workbook* three times a year. Each

⁶⁴ A comprehensive term used in the CIMS to describe local educational agencies, public school academies (charter schools in Michigan are referred to as public school academies), service areas and state agencies. It also means the same as "districts".

workbook contains a series of reports – some for informational purposes and some that require action on the part of the local.

A Series of Reports Containing Local Data

Reports and other tools in the electronic workbook are designed to assist locals with their continuous improvement process. The *CIMS Workbook* guides users by providing a list of tasks that must be completed depending on the local's performance on the SPP indicators and other state priorities. The *CIMS Workbook* helps locals organize, implement and track the status of reports and activities and provides the necessary reports, forms and resources to successfully complete this process. The *CIMS Workbook* contains the following reports:

A Local Strand Report – divides the SPP indicators into compliance and results indicators and provides an annual measure of a local's performance relative to each of the SPP indicator targets.

A Determinations Report – provides an annual rating of a local's performance in meeting the requirements of the IDEA.

A Monitoring Activities Report (MAR) - gives information on the OSE monitoring activities which affect the local including notification of upcoming on-site reviews, state-verified desk audits or state-verified self-reviews. Each workbook provides each local with information regarding the local's performance or other issues identified by the OSE monitoring activities. A MAR may require action. The local reviews the report each monitoring cycle and makes sure required actions are performed and completed by the due date (e.g., if the local does not meet the state graduation target, the MAR instructs the local to identify the root cause of the poor performance, share this hypothesis with the school improvement team and submit a results transmittal through the *CIMS Workbook* for consideration by the specified date).

A Special Education Focused Monitoring Report – is a written notification issued to a local from the OSE citing any areas of noncompliance found during any monitoring activity including focused monitoring or data reviews.

Review and Analysis Process (RAP) Teams

Each local must form a RAP team to review and analyze CIMS reports. Each team provides oversight, guidance and structure in the corrective action or improvement planning process. The RAP team is responsible for (1) reviewing and analyzing local reports and data, and (2) completing the assigned tasks. The work is organized into three categories: compliance and correction, results and improvement and student and child data.

Compliance and Correction

If a local is issued a Report of Findings, it must address the noncompliance by: (1) identifying the root cause(s) of the areas of noncompliance and development/submission of corrective action plans (CAPs), and (2) implementing the CAPs and (3) completing the verification of correction process.

The electronic workbook contains probe questions and CAP forms to guide this process. The OSE requires that research-based practices are used and a list of scientifically-based guidance resources is posted to the CIMS Website at: www.cenmi.org/cims. The OSE reviews and approves all submitted CAPs following a strict protocol. If necessary, the district is required to clarify or modify the CAP prior to the OSE approval. Assigned technical assistance (TA) providers assist with the CAP process for all focused monitoring findings.

RAP teams track the implementation and effectiveness of correction and improvement activities through the workbook and internal processes. Progress reports are submitted to the OSE per an established schedule (see chart below). Once all activities are completed, the local requests closeout of the CAP.

There are two prongs of verification of correction used by the OSE:

- Prong 1 – The local has corrected each individual case of noncompliance and
- Prong 2 – The local is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on the state’s review of new data submissions per established indicator timeframes.

Verification activities may include:

- A review of updated policies, procedures or practices
- A review of the results of student/child record reviews to ensure student-level correction
- Evidence that training or TA was obtained
- A review of new data submitted through the state data systems or through new data logs available in the *CIMS Workbook*.

Based on this review, the OSE establishes that the local is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirements and that the identified noncompliance has been corrected. Once evidence of correction is verified, the OSE notifies the local, closes the CAP and issues a closeout report.

If correction of noncompliance is not completed before the *CIMS Workbook* due date, the OSE mandates TA, training or other enforcement action to promptly bring the local into compliance. A finding remains active until closeout is verified by the OSE.

Corrective Action Plan Dates			
Workbook Starts	CAP Due	Progress Report	Closeout
April 15	June 15	October 1	December 1
August 15	October 15	February 15	April 15
December 15	February 15	June 15	September 15

Results and Improvement

Each April, locals are issued a Strand Report that compares the local's performance on SPP indicators to state targets. The August *CIMS Workbook* contains a data snapshot or a shorter version of the Strand Report. The local then convenes a RAP team and conducts the activities described above.

Student and Child Data

In addition to addressing SPP indicators, locals may be asked to verify data. Specific directions on how to complete student and child data activities are provided to locals through the *CIMS Workbook*, Community of Practice webinars and guidance documents available on the CIMS Website.

A Systemic Approach Leads to Improvement

The CIMS provides locals the tools to see the same data and information the state sees when making monitoring decisions. In addition to helping the state and locals keep track of the tasks and activities required by the IDEA, the CIMS helps locals put special education monitoring into context, defines a predictable schedule of events and establishes a system of improvement.

Information is stored in a single electronic location; this includes corrective action plans, progress reports, student-level data and evidence of correction on findings of noncompliance. Locals are provided processes and tools to guide the improvement and correction activities within a prescribed calendar which will lead to compliance and improved outcomes for children and students with disabilities.

FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report

Appendix B

**Business Rules for Calculation of Local Education Agency
(LEA) Disproportionate Representation in Special
Education and Related Services
for All Disabilities and for Specific Categories
of Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity**

Revision

**Office of Special Education
Michigan Department of Education (MDE)**

**Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation
by Race/Ethnicity in Special Education
(All Disabilities and for Specific Categories of Disabilities)**

April 2011 Revision

1. Disproportionate representation calculations use data from the fall 2009 and fall 2010 Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)⁶⁵ general collections and the Special Education Count files (December 1, 2009⁶⁶ and November 17, 2010⁶⁷). Only students with individualized education programs (IEPs), ages 6 through 21, per the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B definition, are counted.⁶⁸ The racial/ethnic subgroups and residency codes of students are drawn from the data in MSDS, and the disability category is based on the information in the Special Education Child Count. Resident district data refers to the students that live within a district's boundaries with some exceptions. Excluded from the resident district count are students enrolled in schools of choice, non-public schools, home-schools, Public School Academies and entities serving adjudicated students as indicated by residency codes in MSDS.
2. Calculations are only performed for districts with 30 or more students with IEPs.
3. Calculations are only performed for a given racial/ethnic subgroup (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, or Two or More Races) within a district if the total enrollment in the operating district (including special education) for all other racial/ethnic subgroups (total enrollment comparison group) is more than 100.
4. Calculations are only performed for racial/ethnic subgroups with 10 or more students in a given disability category (autism spectrum disorder, cognitive impairment, emotional impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability and speech and language impairment).
5. A weighted risk ratio (WRR) is used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when the district's student population is similar to the state racial/ethnic distribution and there are at least 10 students in the given disability category in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison group).
 - a. For Indicator 9, the comparison group is all students with IEPs of any other racial/ethnic subgroup.

⁶⁵ MSDS is the new statewide data system for all schools/students.

⁶⁶ The Michigan Compliance Information System was the statewide special education data system thru 12/1/09.

⁶⁷ The third Wednesday in November data set contains information on students with disabilities.

⁶⁸ Students who have been placed in facilities for adjudicated youth (as indicated by the student residency code in MSDS) are excluded. Also excluded are students enrolled in the Department of Corrections district code 84020.

- b. For Indicator 10, the comparison group is all students in the specific disability category among the other racial/ethnic subgroups. See the following URL page 16 to 18 for additional resource information:

<https://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

6. A risk ratio (RR) is used instead of the WRR to determine disproportionate representation when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varies significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution. The RR compares identification rates by race/ethnicity against the district's total student population. Specifically:

- a. For Indicator 9, if the number of white or black students with IEPs in a given district is equal to zero, the MDE will forego use of the WRR in favor of the RR in that district. This also applies to Indicator 10, where the number of white or black students in a specific disability category in a given district is equal to zero.
- b. For Indicator 9, when the number of white or black students with IEPs in a given district is fewer than three, if the WRR value is greater than or equal to 2.5 and the RR value is less than or equal to 1.5 (so that the difference between the two measures is greater than or equal to one), MDE will forego use of the WRR in favor of the RR in that district. This also applies to Indicator 10, where the number of white or black students in a specific disability category in a given district is fewer than three. See the following URL page 8 to 12 for additional resource information:

<https://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

7. An alternate risk ratio (ARR) is used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when there are fewer than 10 students with IEPs in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison group). Note: It is not appropriate to forego use of the ARR in favor of the RR unless there are zero Black or White students in a given district.
 - a. For Indicator 9, the comparison group is all students with IEPs of any other racial/ethnic subgroup.
 - b. For Indicator 10, the comparison group is all students in the specific disability category among the other racial/ethnic subgroups. See the following URL pages 21 to 22 for additional resource information:

<https://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

8. Two sets of the three ratios (WRR, ARR and/or RR) are calculated, using the operating_district and resident district data, for each racial/ethnic group across all disabilities and for each racial/ethnic group within each of the six

designated disability categories. Operating district data refers to where the students attend school. All students are included in operating district counts.

- a. If there is an operating district ratio but no resident district ratio (due to a small number of resident students), the operating district ratio is used to determine disproportionate representation.
 - b. If there is no operating district ratio, but there is a resident district ratio, the district is not considered for disproportionate representation.
 - c. Public school academies (PSAs) have only one set of ratios as they are only operating districts.
 - d. Students participating in intermediate school district center programs are reflected in resident district counts.
9. The lower of the district's selected operating district ratio or resident district ratio is used to determine over-representation. Districts are considered to have over-representation when the appropriate ratio (WRR, ARR or RR) is greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group across all disabilities or for any racial/ethnic group within a single disability category.
10. The higher of the district's selected operating district ratio or resident district ratio is used to determine under-representation. Districts are considered to have under-representation when the appropriate ratio (WRR, ARR or RR) is less than 0.4 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group across disabilities or for any racial/ethnic group within a disability category.
11. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation per the above business rules will have an opportunity to verify their data. Upon completion of the verification process, the results will be reviewed in conjunction with data from multiple sources to determine appropriate focused monitoring activities.

Resident District Definition for Analyzing Disproportionate Representation and Significant Disproportionality Data

The purpose of the revised resident district definition/calculation is to limit the students to those that districts have an opportunity to influence their education. The new “resident” definition excludes students enrolled in schools of choice, non-public, home-schooled, PSA students and entities serving adjudicated students. Beginning in 2010-2011, resident district is calculated in the following way.

1. Begin with the MSDS Fall Collection resident count.
2. Subtract students with the following Student Residency codes:
 - Schools of Choice (Codes 02 and 03)
 - Non-Public School (Codes 04 and 08)
 - Home-Schooled (Codes 07 and 15)
 - Juvenile Detention (Codes 09 and 12)
 - New PSAs (Code 10)
3. Filter out all PSAs (mostly xx9xx codes)
4. The MSDS resident student count WILL include the following Student Residency codes:
 - Non-K-12 (Code 01)
 - No Cooperative Agreement, no release, not exempted (Code 05)
 - All other non-resident students (Code 06)— (Please note: It is the operating district that does the MSDS submission—hence these are non-residents of the OPERATING district.) This will include those students who are residents but through an IEP have been placed in another district.
 - School for the Deaf (Code 11)
 - Students with emotional impairments who are served by a Department of Community Health facility (Code 13)
 - All other resident students (Code 14)

In addition, the same parameters set for determining resident district count for the special education population must be applied to the general education population for comparison.

There will be no changes in the calculation of operating district, so:

- PSA and School of Choice students WILL be included in their operating district calculations.
- Non-public school and home school who receive special education ancillary services will be counted in the operating district providing service.

FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report

Appendix C:

Postsecondary Outcomes Survey



Postsecondary Outcomes Survey

You can use a pen or pencil.

Like this: ● Not like this: ✓ ✗ /

Postsecondary School Section

1. At any time since leaving high school, **have you ever** attended any school, job training, or education program?
- No (Go to question 4)
- Yes (Go to question 2)
- (Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)

2. Did you complete an entire term?
- (Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)
- No
- Yes

3. Describe the kind of school or job training program you attended.
- (Please FILL IN **ALL** circles that apply)
- High school completion document or certificate (Adult Basic Education, GED)
 - Short-term education or employment training program (Job Corps, Michigan Works, Summer Employment Program, etc.)
 - ◀ Vocational Technical School – less than 2-year degree program
 - ▶ Community or Technical College to obtain a 2 year degree
 - ▲ College or University to earn a 4 or more year degree
 - ▼ On a mission, in the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.
 - ◀◀ Enrolled in studies while incarcerated in jail or prison
 - ▶▶ Other (please specify): _____

Employment Section

4. At any time since leaving high school, **have you ever** worked?
- (Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)
- No (Go to question 9)
- Yes (Go to question 5)

OVER →

5. Since leaving high school, have you worked at any time for a total of 3 months (about 90 days)?

No

Yes

*(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

6. Think about your most recent job. Did you work on average 20 or more hours per week (or about half time of a 40-hour week)?

No

Yes

*(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

7. Again, thinking about your most recent job, were you paid at least minimum wage (\$7.40 an hour if you are age 18 or older; \$7.25 an hour if you are age 17 or younger; or \$2.65 an hour if you worked in a job where you earned regular tips such as waitstaff in a restaurant)?

No

Yes

*(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

8. Where was your most recent job?

*(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

In a company, business, or service with people with and without disabilities

In the military

◀ In supported employment (paid work with services and wage support to the employer)

▶ Self-employed

▲ In your family's business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering)

▼ In sheltered employment (where most workers have disabilities)

◀◀ Employed while in jail or prison

▶▶ Other (please specify): _____

9. What is your relationship to the former student in question?

I am the former student

I am a parent, guardian, or caregiver of the former student

◀ Other (please specify): _____

*(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)*

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please return it to us in the self-addressed envelope or to:

Dr. Lyke Thompson, Post-School Survey

Wayne State University/Center for Urban Studies

5700 Cass Avenue, 2207 A/AB

Detroit MI 48202