# **Annual Performance Report (APR)** Amendments, April 17, 2012

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| 1 | 9 | In the Measurable and Rigorous Targets table under Calculations using Cohort Four-Year Graduation Rate Methodology<br>and using OSEP's Prescribed One Year Data Lag for 2010<br><br>Bottom of Measurable and Rigorous Targets table | 2010 (using 2009-2010 school year data)<br>Actual=58.7%<br><br>*[8,790 ÷ 14,981] X 100 | 2010 (using 2009-2010 school year data)<br>Actual=57.4%<br><br>*[9,243 ÷ 16,091] X 100 | Additional data verification as part of the state longitudinal data system development identified records for inclusion. |
| 1 | 9 | Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 - First and second paragraph | The four year cohort graduation rate for FFY 2010 was 58.7 percent, but increased one percent over the FFY 2009 rate of 57.3 percent.<br><br>This graduation rate (58.7 percent) describes the result for students with IEPs who completed high school in four years. The FFY 2009 cohort five-year graduation rate is 65 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.<br><br>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. | Additional data verification as part of the state longitudinal data system development identified records for inclusion. |
| 4B | 45 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets<br>Using New Acceptable Methodology per OSEP.<br>Bottom of Measurable and Rigorous Targets table | 2010 (2009-2010 data)<br>Actual=5.9%<br><br>*[49 ÷ 829] X 100 | 2010 (2009-2010 data)<br>Actual=3.3%<br><br>*[27 ÷ 829] X 100 | Monitoring data clarification following submission of the APR. |
| 4B | 45 | In the Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 section, first paragraph | During the 2009-2010 school year, 5.9 percent of districts… | During the 2009-2010 school year, 3.3 percent of districts… | Monitoring data clarification following submission of the APR. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| 4B | 46 | Top of page under Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices | ...identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rates of suspension and expulsion. Of the 131 districts, 93 were newly identified and 38 had been identified using the previous methodology. During February, March and November 2011, based on the focused monitoring criteria, the Office of Special Education (OSE) conducted 35 on-site reviews....<br><br>After monitoring, 49 of the 93 districts were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Each of these districts was issued findings 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 are the number of districts... | ...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....<br><br>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.... | Monitoring data clarification following submission and simplification of reporting. |
| 4B | 46 | Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy Table | American Indian=3<br>Asian=1<br>Black=30<br>Hispanic=9 | American Indian=1<br>Black=18<br>Hispanic=5<br>White=11 | Monitoring data clarification following submission of the APR. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | White=23 | | |
| 4B | 46 | Bottom of page after Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy Table | Of the 93 districts with newly identified discrepant data, 44 had no findings. Eight districts identified and monitored based on the previous methodology are in the year of correction.<br><br>Thirty-eight districts had been monitored the previous year and were implementing a CAP to come into compliance within one year including verification. These districts received a letter informing them… | 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). | Monitoring data clarification following submission and simplification of reporting. |
| 4B | 46 | Footnote at bottom of page | Fourteen districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group. | Seven districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group. | Monitoring data clarification following submission of the APR. |
| 5 | 52-53 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets A, B and C | Target A 2010 Actual=62.8%<br>[120,692 ÷ 192,320] X 100<br><br>Target B 2010 Actual=12.7%<br>[24,456 ÷ 192,320] X 100<br><br>Target C 2010 Actual=5.3%<br>[10,147 ÷ 192,320] X 100 | Target A 2010 Actual=61.6%<br>[120,692 ÷ 195,774] X 100<br><br>Target B 2010 Actual=12.5%<br>[24,456 ÷ 195,774] X 100<br><br>Target C 2010 Actual=5.2%<br>[10,147 ÷ 195,774] X 100 | Incomplete transfer of data into FFY 2010 template. Did not include correctional facilities and parentally placed and private schools. |
| 5 | 53 | Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 – bottom of first paragraph | …192,320, a decrease of 23,136 students, or 10.7 percent. | …195,774, a decrease of 19,682 students, or 9.1 percent. | Updated text to reflect inclusion of correctional facilities and parentally placed and private schools in the |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | | | calculations. |
| 9 | 78 | Top of page | Additional text was added to the end of the first paragraph for clarification. *See Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12.* | An additional eight districts had disproportionate representation data, but had been monitored the previous year and were in the year of correction. | Monitoring data clarification following submission of the APR. |
| 9 | 78 | Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010, second and third paragraph | For FFY 2010, five districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over-representation…<br><br>For FFY 2010, 12 districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to under-representation… | For FFY 2010, seventeen districts were identified with disproportionate representation. Five of seventeen districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over-representation<br><br>For FFY 2010, twelve of seventeen districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to under-representation…. | Monitoring data clarification following submission of the APR. |
| 10 | 88 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets table | Actual=0.9%<br><br>*[7 ÷ 812] X 100 | Actual=0.7%<br><br>*[6 ÷ 812] X 100 | Previous report included data from districts that corrected noncompliance prior to a finding being issued. |
| 10 | 88 | Bottom of page | Seven districts were found to have disproportionate over-representation… | Six districts were found to have disproportionate over-representation… | Previous report included data from districts that corrected noncompliance prior to a finding being issued. |
| 10 | 89 | Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for | …seven districts were identified with | …six districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over- | Previous report included data from |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | FFY 2010, second sentence.<br><br>Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 – end of first paragraph.<br><br>Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 – second paragraph | disproportionate representation…<br><br>Two districts were identified because of over-representation of White students, one in the area of autism spectrum disorder and one in the area of other health impairment.<br><br>Five of the seven 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. One of the districts identified with the same racial/ethnic group and disability area that had participated in focused monitoring activities in 2009-2010 and the CAP was verified and closed completed a desk audit. | representation…<br><br>One district was identified because of over-representation of White students in the area of other health impairment.<br><br>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. | districts that corrected noncompliance prior to a finding being issued. |
| 10 | 89 | FFY 2010 Disproportionate Representation Analysis table – White # and % | White<br>#=1<br>%=0.1% | White<br>#=0<br>%=0.0% | Previous report included data from districts that corrected noncompliance prior to a finding being issued. |
| 11 | 102-103 | Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP – Michigan Response | Additional text was added for clarification. *See Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12.* | … 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., | Per the OSEP Status Table further explanation was required. The |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | | 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.<br><br>Verification of the correction was completed through: 1. A review of new student records demonstrating 100 percent compliance.<br><br>2. A review of documentation of completed activities detailed in the CAP. | explanation includes that the state has verified compliance by all districts (prong 1, prong 2). |
| 13 | 118-119 | Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP – Michigan Response | Additional text was added for clarification. *See Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12.* | … 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% 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.<br>Verification was completed through:<br>1. A review of new student records demonstrating 100 percent compliance.<br>2. A review of documentation of completed activities detailed in the CAP. | Per the OSEP Status Table further explanation was required. The explanation includes that the state has verified compliance by all districts (prong 1, prong 2). |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| 13 | 119-121 | Michigan Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP – Michigan Response | The OSE verified that all findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of notification, that the districts were correctly implementing the secondary transition requirements and the districts have corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless… | … 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% 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.<br><br>Verification was completed through:<br>1. A review of new student records demonstrating 100 percent compliance.<br>2. A review of documentation of completed activities detailed in the CAP.<br>The OSE verified that all findings of each individual case of noncompliance was corrected unless… | Per the OSEP Status Table further explanation was required. The explanation includes that the state has verified compliance by all districts (prong 1, prong 2). |
| 14 | 121 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets table – A measurement<br><br>Measurable and Rigorous Targets table – B measurement<br><br>Measurable and Rigorous Targets table – C measurement | Additional numbers was added for clarification.<br><br>B measurement= [(561 ÷ 1058)] X 100<br><br>C measurement= [(710 ÷ 1058)] X 100 | A measurement=Percent enrolled in higher education (335)<br><br>B measurement= Percent enrolled in higher education (335) or competitively employed (226)<br>[(335 + 226) ÷ 1058] X 100<br><br>C measurement=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)<br>[(335 + 74 + 226 + 75) ÷ 1058] X 100 | Including actual numbers for each mutually exclusive outcome category per Part B Measurement Table. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| 14 | 122 | Discussion of FFY 2010 Data | Additional text and table was added. *See Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12.* | 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. | Included actual numbers for each mutually exclusive outcome category per Part B Measurement Table. |
| 15 | 127 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets table | Actual=98.5%<br><br>*[448 ÷ 455] X 100 | Actual=88.0%<br><br>*[469 ÷ 533] X 100 | Revised numbers due to the implementation of additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV). |
| 15 | 128 | Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 – first sentence | Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 15; however, Michigan's timely correction of noncompliance increased from 93.0 percent to 98.4 percent. | Michigan did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100 percent for Indicator 15. There was a five percent slippage from the previous year. | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |
| 15 | 128 | Paragraphs after Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 | Additional text was added for clarification. *See Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12.* | Clarification from OSEP's CIV:<br>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 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | | its FFY 2011 APR submission due on February 1, 2013.<br><br>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. | |
| 15 | 131 | INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET -<br>Other areas of noncompliance:<br>Evaluation Process - Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=0 | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=19<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=21<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=7 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV regarding unrelated findings. |
| 15 | 131 | INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET –<br>Other areas of noncompliance:<br>IEP Development –<br><br>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=40<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=42<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=13 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV regarding unrelated findings. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | no later than one year from identification=0 | | |
| 15 | 132 | INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET –<br>Other areas of noncompliance:<br>IEP Implementation –<br><br>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=0 | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=4<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=4<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=1 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV regarding unrelated findings. |
| 15 | 132 | INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET –<br>Other areas of noncompliance:<br>IEP Participation –<br><br>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0 | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=9<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=10 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV regarding unrelated findings. |
| 15 | 132 | INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET –<br>Other areas of noncompliance:<br>Previous Enrollment in Special Education –<br><br>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=0 | # of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=1<br><br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=1 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV regarding unrelated findings. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| 15 | 133 | INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET – Very end | The worksheet automatically sums Column a and b<br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=455<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=448<br><br>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = 98.5% | The worksheet automatically sums Column a and b<br>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)=533<br><br>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification=469<br><br>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = 88% | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |
| 15 | 134 | Correction of Noncompliance – first paragraph | Of the 443 findings issued during FFY 2009, 436 were corrected within one year. The table below provides the current status for each of the seven findings that remained uncorrected after one year. | 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. | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |
| 15 | 135 | Timely Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance table | 1=443<br>2=436<br>3=7 | 1=533<br>2=469<br>3=64 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |
| 15 | 135 | FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected table | 4=7<br>5=7<br>6=0 | 4=64<br>5=7<br>6=57 | Revision needed due to additional OSEP guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |
| 15 | 143-144 | Michigan Response Table | Additional text was added for clarification. *See Revised* | Michigan verified that each district with noncompliance findings | Revision needed due to additional OSEP |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | *wording as submitted 4/17/12.*<br><br>Of the seven districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, three districts: | (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.<br>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.<br><br>Of the seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, all seven findings (within the five districts) were verified that they were: | guidance provided as a result of the CIV. |
| 20 | 165 | Measurable and Rigorous Targets table | Actual=100% | Actual=98.83% | Per OSEP's request Michigan revised the verification process that is now consistent with OSEP's expectations.<br><br>Per correction of Indicator 14, the valid and reliable data were changed from zero to one. |
| 20 | 165-166 | Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010 – first and third paragraph. | Michigan met…<br><br>In FFY 2010, Michigan consulted with the DAC to complete the data rubric for | Michigan did not meet…<br><br>Michigan received a 98.83 percent for timely and accurate data reporting due to discrepancies in data reported for Indicator 15 | Per OSEP's request, Michigan revised the verification process that is now consistent with |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | this indicator (see below). | (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).<br>For more information, reference FFY 2010 APR Indicator 15. | OSEP's expectations. |
| 20 | 166 | Second paragraph, last sentence under "Data" | Data verification was also done by the OSE staff, contractors, and other state offices.<br><br>Michigan also verified Indicators 15 (Compliance Findings), 16 (State Complaints), 17 (Hearings Adjudicated), 18 (Resolution Session Agreements) and 19 (Mediation Agreements) data. Indicator leads investigated data anomalies and corrected inaccurate data. | For other indicators, data verification was done by the OSE staff, contractors, and other state offices. | Description revised for clarity. |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | Grantees verified data for Indicators 7 (Preschool Outcomes), 8 (Facilitated Parent Involvement), 9 (Disproportionate Representation-Child with a Disability), 10 (Disproportionate Representation-Eligibility Categories), 12 (Early Childhood Transition), 13 (Secondary Transition) and 14 (Postsecondary Outcomes). Grantees employed edit checks and examined the data for outliers. Any data anomalies were further investigated and resolved.<br>Other state offices and agencies [1]that provided data for Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout),<br>3 (Statewide Assessment) and 5 (Educational Environments) also utilized numerous data edit checks and comprehensive data verification protocols. | | |
| 20 | 167 | Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric: Indicator 15, Subtotal, Grand Total | Indicator 15<br>Valid and Reliable=1<br>Correct Calculation=1<br>Total=2<br>Subtotal=40 | Indicator 15<br>Valid and Reliable=0<br>Correct Calculation=1<br>Total=1<br>Subtotal=39 | Per OSEP's approval, Michigan revised the calculation which is now consistent with OSEP's expectations |

| Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Ind** | **Page** | **Location on page** | **Wording as submitted 2/1/12** | **Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12** | **Reason for change** |
| | | | Grand Total=45 | Grand Total=44 | for correction of Indicator 14. |
| 20 | 168 | 618 Data - Indicator 20: Table 1, Table 3, and end of table (subtotal, grand total, Indicator score) | Table 1<br>Responded to Data Notes=1<br>Total=4<br><br>Table 3<br>Responded to Data Notes=1<br>Total=4<br><br>Subtotal=22<br>Grand total=45.00<br>A. APR Grand Total=45.00<br>B. 618 Grand Total=45.00<br>C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =90.00<br>Total N/A in 618=0<br>Base=90.00<br>D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*)=1.00<br>E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D X 100)=100.00 | Table 1<br>Responded to Data Notes=N/A<br>Total=3<br><br>Table 3<br>Responded to Data Notes=N/A<br>Total=3<br><br>Subtotal=20<br>Grand total=40.91<br>A. APR Grand Total=44.00<br>B. 618 Grand Total=40.91<br>C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =84.91<br>Total N/A in 618=4.0908<br>Base=85.91<br>D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*)=0.988<br>E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D X 100)=98.83 | Per OSEP's Indicator #20 Rubric, Table 1 and Table 3 Data Notes indicate N/A. |