

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES
EDUCATION ACT (IDEA) 2004

Nebraska
IDEA Part B
Annual Performance Report

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Submitted February 2, 2009
by
Nebraska Department of Education

This report was prepared by the Nebraska Department of
Education

For more information contact:
Nebraska Department of Education
Office of Special Education
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987
(402) 471-2471
<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/SPED/sppindex.html>

February 2009

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

IDEA Part B: Annual Performance Report (APR) FFY 2007 (2007-2008) February 2, 2009

Table of Contents

Indicator #	SPP Indicator Topic	Page #	NDE Staff Contact
	Overview of Part B APR Development	3	Sara Farrand sara.farrand@nebraska.gov
1	Graduation rate	6	Sara Farrand sara.farrand@nebraska.gov
2	Dropout rate	8	Sara Farrand sara.farrand@nebraska.gov
3	Statewide assessment: participation and performance	10	Carla Osberg carla.osberg@nebraska.gov
4	Suspension/expulsion rates	18	Adria Bace adria.bace@nebraska.gov
5	Least Restricted Environment (LRE) for students ages 6-21	20	Teresa Coonts teresa.coonts@nebraska.gov
6	LRE for children ages 3-5	22	Jan Thelen jan.thelen@nebraska.gov
7	Child outcomes for children ages 3-5	23	Jan Thelen jan.thelen@nebraska.gov
8	Parent involvement	29	Jeanne Heaston jeanne.heaston@nebraska.gov
9	Disproportionality of race/ethnicity in special education and related services	32	Pete Biaggio pete.biaggio@nebraska.gov
10	Disproportionality of race/ethnicity in disability categories	35	Pete Biaggio pete.biaggio@nebraska.gov
11	Evaluation complete in 60 days	38	Rita Hammitt rita.hammitt@nebraska.gov
12	Transition from Part C to Part B with Individual Education Plan (IEP) by third	41	Joan Luebbers joan.luebbers@nebraska.gov
13	Transition planning on IEP by age 16	43	Lindy Foley lindy.foley@nebraska.gov
14	Post-School outcomes	45	Lindy Foley lindy.foley@nebraska.gov
15	Noncompliance corrected within one year	47	Jeanne Heaston jeanne.heaston@nebraska.gov
16	State complaints resolved within 60 days	52	Denise Wright denise.wright@nebraska.gov
17	Due process completed within 45 days	53	Denise Wright denise.wright@nebraska.gov
18	Resolution sessions that result in agreement	54	Denise Wright denise.wright@nebraska.gov
19	Mediations that result in agreement	55	Denise Wright denise.wright@nebraska.gov
20	State reported data to OSEP on time and accurate	57	Sara Farrand sara.farrand@nebraska.gov
Appendix 1	Impact Areas Improvement Strategies	60	Rose Dymacek rose.dymacke@nebraska.gov
Appendix 2	Parent Survey (Indicator 8)	80	Jeanne Heaston jeanne.heaston@nebraska.gov
Appendix 3	618 Table 6 (Indicator 3)	85	Sara Farrand sara.farrand@nebraska.gov
Appendix 4	618 Table 7 (Indicators 16-19)	105	Sara Farrand sara.farrand@nebraska.gov

Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007 February 2, 2009

Overview of Annual Performance Plan (APR) Development

The State Annual Performance Report is to be submitted annually in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II). The first APR was submitted to OSEP February 1, 2007 following the submission of the State Performance Plan December 2, 2005. In each APR submission to OSEP, the State is required to provide a description of the process the State used to develop the APR. The description must include how and when the State will report annually to the public on (1) the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP; and (2) the performance of each local educational agency located in the State on the targets in the SPP.

Process Used to Develop the APR

Throughout 2007-08 and continuing through the completion of the APR in January, 2008, planning and development sessions were held with NDE Special Education Office staff, including the State Director of Special Education, management team and program consultants.

Individuals and small groups were assigned as appropriate to facilitate the collection and examination of SPP/APR data, and to assure continued integration of activities. Cross-team meetings were held regularly with other teams within the SEA, especially the State Assessment Team, Federal Programs Team (NCLB), Early Childhood Team, Part C Team, and Data Center Team, to ensure that data, resources, activities and timelines were aligned to the greatest extent possible across teams.

A variety of key stakeholder groups were involved in discussions during 2007-08 seeking input for the continued development of targets, improvement activities, timelines and resources as appropriate to each of the Indicators in the SPP/APR.

The Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center facilitated the gathering of input on several Indicators with internal and state-level committees. Information and training related to Nebraska's APR and SPP Indicators were provided, and discussion and feedback sought from the following stakeholder groups throughout the year in a wide variety of venues: Nebraska Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Nebraska Council of School Administrators, Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors, NDE-ESU Collaborative Group, Results Matter Child Measurement Task Force, Results Matters early childhood outcomes training series; Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council, NDE Special Education regional workshops for administrators and practitioners, and Early Childhood Administrators workshops.

Stakeholder Group Input

SEAC's support and feedback were sought at the quarterly Council meetings held throughout the year. Council members showed particular interest in Indicator 1 regarding the calculation of graduates based on students who complete high school within four years. The impact of Indicator 3 on children with disabilities was the focus of discussions as Nebraska's statewide assessment process changed based on state legislative action. The results of the survey conducted regarding post-secondary outcomes (Indicator 14) also received considerable SEAC interest.

The state Transition Advisory Committee worked on a variety of issues related to Indicators 13 and 14 for secondary transition and post-school outcomes and contributed recommendations for these SPP/APR Indicators. NDE continues to seek support from various national technical assistance centers including National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) and National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO).

The NDE Results Matter team hosted a series of early childhood curriculum and assessment trainings across the state throughout 2007-08 for Birth-Five teachers and practitioners in school-based EC programs and their community partners. As a result of priority needs identified by statewide stakeholders in a September 2007 Birth-Five Strategic Planning meeting, workgroups were convened in November 2007 to develop four new resource documents for practitioners related to the development of functional, participation-based IFSPs and IEPs. These draft documents were presented for discussion and feedback

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

at the Nebraska Birth-Five Summer Conference in June 2008, hosted by NDE and HHS. Conference training focused on inclusive practices and developing functional, participation-based child and family outcomes for IFSPs and IEPs (Part B Indicators 6, 7 and 8; and Part C Indicators 2, 3 and 4). Discussion and input was gathered from the workgroups and participants at the Summer Conference, which included B-5 practitioners; services coordinators; local ICC members; and program administrators. These new resource documents were finalized and NDE-HHS began statewide distribution in August 2008. Throughout 2007-08, the state-level Results Matter Child Measurement Task Force provided ongoing guidance and direction to NDE around child and family outcomes work. In addition, the Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council was engaged in discussions and provided input related to the early childhood outcomes and family surveys throughout 2007-08.

In November 2007, Nebraska was selected as a national CSEFEL state for promoting social-emotional competence in young children, one of the three child outcomes for Part B Indicator 7 and Part C Indicator 3. A state steering committee was convened in January 2008 to provide oversight and coordinate training and technical assistance to the four CSEFEL demonstration sites. It will continue to provide direction and input regarding feasibility of statewide implementation and sustainability for the three years of this capacity-building project.

In the area of Indicator 5, NDE continued provide training in the areas of RtI, low incidence disabilities, inclusive practices, and assessment and accommodations in general education classrooms.

During October, 2008 a series of four regional special education workshops were hosted at locations across Nebraska by the NDE Special Education Office. Topics addressed in these workshops included the SPP/APR Indicators. In addition, Nebraska sought to group the SPP/APR indicators around central topics, in order to increase awareness of the impact each indicator has on other indicators. The process to develop these Impact Areas included several meetings of a stakeholder group to design the concept and out of the larger group, four smaller groups formed to better develop the ideas and the focus of each Impact area.

Grouping related State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators and Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD) inquiries into meaningful categories enables Nebraska Department of Education (NDE), Nebraska Department of Health of Health and Human Services (NDHHS), Educational Service Units (ESUs), school districts and local early intervention service programs to look at the bigger picture of improving outcomes and accountability rather than a piecemeal process – indicator by indicator or inquiry by inquiry. As data is clustered around a broad impact area, decisions are made based on a number of data points rather than from a single data point in isolation. The Impact Areas create an overarching umbrella that ties together the Part B and Part C SPP Indicators, ILCD inquires, Determinations, and Public Reporting into categories for targeted improvement with a projected outcome of improved results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The NDE/ESU Collaborative Group continued to provide input throughout 2007-08 to facilitators for ILCD for their school districts and ESUs, this group of special education program coordinators and supervisors, as they are responsible for helping school districts meet all of the compliance and performance requirements of the SPP Indicators.

Dissemination of the February 1, 2008 SPP and APR to the public will follow standard NDE policies and procedures.

Reporting to the Public

Nebraska will continue to use the NDE Special Education's Office website to annually report to the public on Nebraska's progress and/or slippage in meeting the State Performance Plan (SPP) measurable and rigorous targets. The Annual Performance Reports will also be reported on the website, which can be found using the following web address:

<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/SPED/sppindex.html>

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Through the NDE State of the Schools Report (SOSR) website, Nebraska will annually report district and state level data to the public. The annual SPP data reported for each school district (LEA) in the state on SOSR will include LEA performance on each SPP Indicator, and whether the district has met or not met the established SPP targets.

SOSR is the vehicle used to report State Performance Plan data, as it is NDE's public reporting tool for displaying district and state level data for all students in Nebraska schools, The Nebraska SOSR is located at the following web address:

<http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Main/Home.aspx>

Beginning in spring 2009, the annual public release of LEA performance on SPP targets will move away from the deployment dates established for SOSR to comply with Federal Regulation requiring states to publicly report on targets 120 days after the submission of the APR. According to NDE protocol, this annual spring release will continue to include windows of opportunity for school districts to review and confirm the data prior to public release.

As required by state and federal law, NDE will not report to the public any information on performance that would result in the disclosure of personally identifiable information about individual children, or when the available data are insufficient to yield statistically reliable information.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Data Source: State of the Schools Report and Special Education Student Information System (SE SIS) child count and exit data.

Measurement: The measurement for all youth is calculated by dividing the number of high school diploma recipients by the sum of dropouts for grades nine through twelve respectively, in consecutive years, plus the number of high school diploma recipient.

The measurement for special education students is calculated by dividing the number of high school diploma recipients, ages 17 through 19 by the sum of dropouts for grades nine through twelve respectively, in consecutive years (using age 15 in grade 9, ages 15-16 in grade 10, ages 16-17 in grade 11, ages 17-19 in grade 12), plus the number of high school diploma recipients.

Measurement for youth with IEPs is the same measurement as for all youth.

The requirements for a regular diploma in Nebraska are the same for all youth including youth with IEPs and are described in detail in Nebraska's SPP.

Applied:

- a. 2050 - high school diploma recipients, ages 17 through 19, with IEPs
- b. 2862 - sum of dropouts with IEPs for grades nine through twelve respectively, in consecutive years (using age 15 in grade 9 (18 students), ages 15-16 in grade 10 (107 students), ages 16-17 in grade 11 (256 students), ages 17-19 in grade 12 (433 students), plus the number of high school diploma recipients with IEPs (2050))

[(a) divided by (b)] times 100 = 71.63

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	74.9% or more of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

71.63% of youth with IEPs graduated from high school with a regular diploma in FFY2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

The graduation rate increased from 66.92% in FFY 2006 to 71.63%. While Nebraska did not meet the target of 74.9%, the improvement activities resulted in an increase in performance of 4.71%.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Data Source: State of the Schools Report and Special Education Student Information System (SE SIS) enrollment and exit data.

Measurement: The measurement for all youth is calculated by dividing the total number of 7-12th grade students who dropped out, by the official fall enrollment for grades 7-12.

The measurement for special education students is calculated by dividing the number of special education students, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education by dropping out, by the total number of special education students, ages 14 through 21.

A dropout for youth with IEPs is the same definition as used in the Part B 618 reports. The definition of a dropout for youth with IEPs is: youth who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period, were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period, and did not exit special education through any other base. This row includes dropouts, runaways, GED recipients (in cases where students are required to drop out of the secondary educational program in order to pursue the GED certificate), expulsions, status unknown, students who moved and are not known to be continuing in another educational program.

Measurement for all youth in Nebraska is calculated by dividing the total number of 7th -12th grade students who dropped out by the official fall enrollment for grades 7-12.

For all students a dropout is defined as: enrolled in school the previous school year but did not enroll at the beginning of the current school year, and has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district-approved education program

Applied:

- a. 650 special education students, ages 14 through 21, who exited special education by dropping out
- b. 16,969 special education students, ages 14 through 21

[(a) divided by (b)] times 100 = 3.83%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007	2.36% or less of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

(2007-2008	
------------	--

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

3.83% of youth with IEPs dropped out of high school in FFY2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

The dropout rate decreased from ~~3.98%~~ 3.89% in FFY 2006 to 3.83% in FFY 2007. While Nebraska did not meet the target of 2.36%, the improvement activities resulted in an increase in performance of .15%. In addition, with the new longitudinal data system, Nebraska is able to find a more accurate unduplicated total of kids served through the 2007-2008 school year who should be included in the dropout rate denominator.

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 68 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.**
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size in the State)] times 100.</p>
<p>Applied:</p> <p>35 districts that met the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)</p> <p>divided by</p> <p>66 districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size</p> <p>times 100 = <u>53.03%</u></p>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2007 (2007-2008)	Because the current targets in the SPP are the same as the 3C targets, the target for 3A needed to be revised. This target is being set at 53%.

FFY	Revised Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	53% of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

2008 (2008-2009)	53.25% of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
2009 (2009-2010)	53.25% of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
2010 (2010-2011)	53.5% of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

Districts With Disability Subgroup Making AYP			
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
# Districts with the minimum "n" in the subgroup of students with disabilities	56	61	66
# Districts making AYP	28	44	35
% of Districts AYP	50.00%	72.13%	53.03%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska demonstrated slippage in Indicator 3A from FFY 2006 data of 72.13% to 53.03% in FFY 2007. This slippage represents a decrease of 15.21%. State targets for both math and reading at all grade levels were increased in 2007. While the achievement levels for the subgroup of student with disabilities continued improve, the AYP targets were reset at a more rigorous level for all students, which explain the slippage from FFY 2006.

Nebraska met its revised target of 53% for FFY 2007 for this indicator.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.**
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a, but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95.0% of Nebraska’s students with disabilities will participate in the Nebraska STARS assessments in math which includes the Alternate Assessment. • 95.0% of Nebraska’s students with disabilities will participate in the Nebraska STARS assessments in reading which includes the Alternate Assessment. .
Nebraska has excluded the writing target since it is not required. Participation targets in reading and math assessments remain the same.	

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

2007-2008 Participation Rate in STARS Math Assessments						
Grade	# Students with IEPs	# and % Reg. Assmt. No Accommodations	# and % Reg. Assmt. With Accommodations	# and % Alt. Assmt. Alternate Standards	# and % Alt. Assessment Grade level Standards	# and % Not Assessed
Totals Grades 3-8, 11	22,995	12,130 (52.75%)	8,644 (37.95%)	1,436 (6.24%)	0 (0%)	785 (1.74%)

2007-2008 Participation Rate in STARS Reading Assessments						
Grade	# Students with IEPs	# and % Reg. Assmt. No Accommodations	# and % Reg. Assmt. With Accommodations	# and % Alt. Assmt. Alternate Standards	# and % Alt. Assessment Grade level Standards	# and % Not Assessed
Totals Grades 3-8, 11	23,089	12,425 (53.81%)	8,681 (37.60%)	1,419 (6.15%)	0 (0%)	564 (1.24%)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska met its target of 95.0% for both Math and Reading for FFY 2007 for this indicator.

Nebraska demonstrated slippage in Indicator 3B from FFY 2006 data of 97.22% for math and 98.14% for reading, to 96.59% for math and 97.56% for reading in FFY 2007. The progress represents a decrease of .64% in math and .58% in reading. This slight decrease in participation rates is due to the inclusion of both special education counts and assessment reporting in the longitudinal Nebraska Student Staff Reporting System in 2007. Assessment data is now collected on an individual student basis rather than an aggregate count, which improves the accuracy of our data and accounts for minor changes in total percentages. The 2007 rates are more reflective of actual test participation for students with disabilities and indicate that this subgroup continues to exceed the state target of 95%.

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.**

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

Measurement:

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).

Account for any children included in a, but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
2007 (2007-2008)	Elementary Math	83%	Middle School Math	79%	High School Math	81%
	Reading	81%	Reading	81%	Reading	83%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Math		
Grade Level Groupings	# of Students with IEPs at Time of Assessment	# and % of Students with IEPs Proficient or Above With and Without Accommodations (includes alternate assessment)
Elementary Grades 3-5	11,071	8,885 (80.25%)
Middle School Grades 6-8	9,410	6,647 (70.63%)
High School Grade 11	2,514	1,513 (60.18%)
Totals	22,995	17,045 (74.12%)
Reading		
Elementary Grades 3-5	11,064	8,444 (76.31%)
Middle School Grades 6-8	9,435	6,865 (72.76%)
High School Grade 11	2,590	1,835 (70.85%)
Totals	23,089	17,144 (74.25%)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

While Nebraska did not meet the targets: Elementary – 83% for Math, 81% for reading; Middle School – 79% for Math, 81% for reading; High School – 81% for Math, 83% for reading, Nebraska demonstrated progress in Indicator 3C from the FFY 2006 data.

Elementary math proficiency increased from 75.45% in FFY 2006 to 80.25% in FFY 2007. The progress represents an increase of 4.80%.

Elementary reading proficiency increased from 71.14% in 2006-07 to 76.31%. The progress represents an increase of 5.17%.

Middle School math proficiency increased from 64.85% in 2006-07 to 70.63% in FFY 2007. The progress represents an increase of 5.78%.

Middle School reading proficiency increased from 68.86% in FFY 2006 to 72.76% in FFY 2007. The progress represents an increase of 3.90%.

High School math proficiency increased from 55.90% in FFY 2006 to 60.18% in FFY 2007. The progress represents an increase of 4.28%.

High School reading proficiency rose from 65.76% in FFY 2006 to 70.85% in FFY 2007. The progress represents an increase of 5.09%.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Applied:

- A. 0 districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year
divided by
254 districts in the state
times 100 = 0%
- B. Not applicable for the FFY 2007 reporting period.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Decrease to a suspension and expulsion rate of 4.75% or less for each LEA.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

The NDE compares suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities, for greater than 10 days in a school year, among the LEAs, or school districts, in the state. Comparable general education suspension/expulsion data is not collected thus a comparison of suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities to rates for children without disabilities cannot be calculated.

Nebraska's definition of "**significant discrepancy**" is:

- a) a suspension or expulsion rate of 4.75% or more of the school district's special education membership

and

- b) the school district suspends or expels more than 5 students.

Nebraska analyzed the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data, submitted on November 1, 2008, for significant discrepancies. The results indicate that all of Nebraska's 254 school districts are meeting Nebraska's performance target. (OMB 1820.0621)

In addition, for the one school district identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2006, a review was conducted, and when appropriate revision required, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

As a result of this review, noncompliance was not identified in the one school district. A discussion of correction of noncompliance is not included because no noncompliance was identified during the FFY 2006 review.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska's data for this indicator represent progress from its FFY 2006 data of 0.4%.

Nebraska met its revised FFY 2007 target.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 68 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed its targets for this indicator as suggested by OSEP and has met with stakeholders to set new targets and will begin putting together new baseline data for the 2008-2009 school year. In reviewing the data and the suggestions from OSEP, Nebraska will revise the targets for Section A and identify significant discrepancy as any district that is suspending or expelling students for greater than ten days at a rate higher than 3.0 times the state rate. Nebraska did not revise the target for the FFY 2207 reporting period due to most of the reporting period having ended prior to the OSEP response.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% 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 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.

Applied (using 618 data):

- A. $27,930/40,508 = 68.9\%$
- B. $2,816/40,508 = 6.95\%$
- C. $1,023/40,508 = 2.52\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
	Removed from regular classroom less than 21% of day	Removed from regular classroom greater than 60% of day	Separate and outside placements combined
2007 (2007-2008)	58.7% or more of students with disabilities	12.0% or less of students with disabilities	2.8% or less of students with disabilities

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY 2007		
	Removed from regular classroom less than 21% of day	Removed from regular classroom greater than 60% of day	Separate and outside placements combined
2007 (2007-2008)	68.9% of students with disabilities	6.95% of students with disabilities	2.52% of students with disabilities

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska’s data for this indicator slipped/improved in FFY 2007: ~~58.5~~ **69.91**% of students with disabilities removed from the regular classroom for less than 21% of the day in FFY 2006 to 68.9% in FFY 2007. This represents a decrease of ~~40.4~~ **1.01**%. ~~42.2~~ **7.24**% of students with disabilities removed from the regular classroom greater than 60% of the day in FFY 2006 to 6.95% in FFY 2007 this represents a decrease of ~~5.25~~ **.29**%. ~~3.0~~ **3.78**% of students with disabilities placed in separate and outside placements combined in FFY 2006 to 2.52% in FFY 2007. This represents a decrease of ~~.48~~ **1.26**%. Nebraska met its FFY 2007 targets in all three areas (A, B, C).

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This Indicator addresses the proportion of preschool children with disabilities, ages 3 through 5, who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers. This information assists the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) to evaluate whether preschool children with disabilities are served in the least restrictive environment.

Per OSEP Instructions for the FFY 2007 SPP/APR, states are not required to report on Indicator 6 in the FFY 2007 APR due February 2009.

Baseline Data

Discussion of Baseline Data

Improvement Activities/Timelines

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Measurement:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
 - a. **Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**
 - b. **Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**
 - c. **Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**
 - e. **Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
 - a. **Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**
 - b. **Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**
 - c. **Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.**
 - d. **Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to**

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# 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 = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Nebraska is implementing a state early childhood outcomes measurement, data collection and reporting system to obtain required child and family outcomes data, with ongoing direction and support from the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center and the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

This web-based system, called Results Matter in Nebraska, is designed to improve programs and supports for all young children birth to age five served by school districts, the Early Development Network (Part C) and their partners. Results Matter also integrates the state requirements of Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) Rule 11, Regulations for Early Childhood Programs, with respect to reporting child outcomes, including child performance and progress. The outcomes apply to all school-based early childhood programs, including all state grant-funded early childhood programs.

As part of the Results Matter initiative, school districts are to report child outcomes data online, selecting one or more of three observational child assessment tools recommended by Nebraska's state-level Results Matter Child Measurement Task Force in November, 2005. The three state-selected and approved assessments for preschool children are: Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System for Infants and Children (AEPS), 2nd Edition (Brookes Publishing Company, 2003); Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Assessment Toolkit for Ages 3-5 (Teaching

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Strategies, Inc. 2006); and High/Scope Child Observation Record (COR) for Preschool children (High/Scope Press, 2002).

These research-based, authentic assessment tools were selected due to their reported high reliability and validity, and their link to curriculum and program planning. Scientifically-based cutoff scores defining comparability to same-aged peers has been determined by each of these publishers, which maximizes the validity of the data used to report on each of the OSEP EC Outcomes. The Nebraska Department of Education is the state's licensed manager for the online subscription agreements with each of these vendors.

For FFY2007 (2007-08), 179 of Nebraska's 252 school districts were using AEPSi.com; 107 districts were using Highscope.net, and 80 districts were using Creativecurriculum.net (total is more than 252 districts because districts may elect to use more than one of the assessment tools)

Since January, 2007, all school districts in Nebraska have been required to utilize the Results Matter online data collection and reporting system for all newly-verified children. As of June 30, 2008 a total of 1,145 preschool children with IEPs had entry data online in the Results Matter system. Of these, 722 preschoolers had entry/exit data to be included in the FFY2007 OSEP Report.

Baseline Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):

Baseline data is not applicable for FFY2007. According to OSEP reporting time lines, progress data (entry and exit data) for children who were part of Results Matter for 2007-08 must be provided in the FFY2008 SPP/APR due February 1, 2010, as well as in the SPP/APR due February 1, 2010.

Progress data reported in 2010 will be considered baseline data. The 2007-2008 progress data for preschool children is presented in the Progress Data tables below.

The 2005-06 SPP/APR contained a description of how data are to be collected so that Nebraska will be able to report baseline data, targets, and improvement activities per OSEP Instructions. No changes have been made to that process. Please see Nebraska's FFY2005 SPP/APR for a description of the process at www.nde.state.ne.us/SPED/sppindex.html.

Discussion of Progress Data for FFY 2007 – Description, Results and Analysis 2007-2008:

Description

Beginning in January, 2007, all school districts in Nebraska were required to begin online data collection and reporting for all newly-verified children. As a result of the 2007 statewide start date, Part B preschool numbers reported for 2007-08 are lower than in future years, as there are preschool children who entered the system prior to Nebraska's initiation of the data collection process. In addition, High Scope, one of the three assessment tools used in Nebraska, changed online system companies in 2008. Pearson (the previous online company) had not made the necessary modifications to the online system to successfully run the OSEP reports. As a result, limited data from this assessment system could be successfully retrieved for analysis this year. NDE is working closely with the High Scope Foundation and Red-e-Set-Grow, who have established the new online system (OnlineCOR). Processes are now in place for analyzing the data for the OSEP reports for 2008-2009.

Results: FFY2007 Progress Data for Nebraska

OSEP Child Outcomes Report-FFY2007 Progress Data for Nebraska – Measurement A

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of Preschoolers	% of Preschoolers
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning.	15	2.1% (15 of 722)
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	37	5.2% (37 of 722)
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	27	3.7% (27 of 722)
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	63	8.7% (63 of 722)
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	580	80.3% (580 of 722)
Total	N =722	100%

OSEP Child Outcomes Report-FFY2007 Progress Data for Nebraska – Measurement B

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of Preschoolers	% of Preschoolers
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning.	14	1.9% (14 of 722)
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	36	5.1% (36 of 722)
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	22	3.0% (22 of 722)
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	71	9.8% (71 of 722)
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	579	80.2% (579 of 722)
Total	N = 722	100%

OSEP Child Outcomes Report-FFY2007 Progress Data for Nebraska – Measurement C

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of Preschoolers	% of Preschoolers
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning.	13	1.8 % (13 of 722)
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	32	4.4% (32 of 722)
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	19	2.6% (19 of 722)
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	67	9.3% (67 of 722)
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	591	81.9% (591 of 722)
Total	N = 722	100%

Analysis of Progress Data

In April, 2008, the Results Matter Management Team met with the three publishers, along with representatives from the ECO Center, Colorado Department of Education (CDE), and NECTAC to discuss the trend of low percentage of preschool children demonstrating delays that has been apparent in the analysis of OSEP data. It was recommended that a qualitative study be completed. Preschool children were selected in situations where the children were assessed as “comparable to same aged peers” and the providers disagreed with the findings. The evaluation consultant for Results Matters interviewed these providers and rated the children using the COSF scale. This data was reviewed with the staff from ECO Center, NECTAC, NDE, CDE and the publishers in August 2008. It was decided at that time that adjustments needed to be made to the online analysis. Specific recommendations for modifications will be determined later this fall. In addition, review will continue regarding the implementation of Results Matter Initiatives in both states (Colorado and Nebraska) in order to improve assessment and instructional practices, implement fidelity processes, and improve the quality of the outcome data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	NA – New Indicator. Entry data required.
2006 (2006-2007)	NA – Progress (entry and exit) data required for children who have been in the program for at least six months.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

2007 (2007-2008)	NA – Progress data required
2008 (2008-2009)	NA – Progress data required
2009 (2009-2010)	NA – Progress data required
2010 (2010-2011)	Baseline and targets required in the FFY2010 SPP/APR due February 1, 2010.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY2007 and their impact on the data reported in this Indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/ Improvement Activities/ Timelines/ Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this Indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	69.2% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007: 77.6%

Display 8-1: Percent of Parents Who Report that the School Facilitated Their Involvement

Total number of Parent respondents	1,509
Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	1,171
Percentage who reported school facilitated their involvement	77.6%

The target of 69.2% was met.

In spring 2007, Parent Surveys were given to parents with children attending only those LEAs who were part of the 2007-08 ILCD cycle. Specifically, all parents of students age 3-21 receiving special education services during the 2007-08 school year at these LEAs were given a survey. Districts either distributed the survey to parents after IEP meetings or mailed the surveys to parents. Parents were asked to complete and then mail the survey to the regional office. Parents were assured of anonymity.

A total of 9,117 surveys were distributed, and 1,509 were returned for a response rate of 16.5%.

To arrive at the percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement, a “percent of maximum” scoring procedure was used. A “percent of maximum” score based on 18 of the items was calculated for each respondent. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “5” (Strongly Agree) on each of the 18 items received a 100% score; a respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “1” (Strongly Disagree) on each of the 18 items received a 0% score. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “4” (Agree) on each of the 18 items received a 75% score. (Note: a

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

respondent who **on average** rated their experiences a “4”, e.g., a respondent who rated 8 items a “4,” 5 items a “3” and 5 items a “5,” would also receive a percent of maximum score of 75%.)

Reliability and Validity

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are generally representative by district, by race/ethnicity of the child, by grade level of the child, and by the primary disability of the child. However, parents of white students were slightly more likely to respond than parents of non-white children; 82% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children are white and 70% of special education students in the monitored districts are white. In addition, surveys were returned from parents of children of all grade levels and disability categories. Results were weighted by district to reflect the differential response rates by district and to ensure results were representative of the state as a whole.

Five districts did not return their raw data files to NDE in time to be included in the state results. These districts have administered the survey, but for various reasons were unable to get the scanned raw data files to NDE. Once these districts send their data to NDE, we will be updating the results. Since one of the larger districts is included in the five, it had an impact on the rate of return percentage. We have changed the follow up procedures to ensure that this will not be an issue with the Year 4 collection of data.

Explanation of progress or slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement decreased from 79.0% in FFY 2006 to 77.6% in FFY 2007. This represents a decrease of 1.4%.

As indicated in Display 8-2, the percentage of parents who reported that the school facilitated their involvement increased from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006 and then slightly decreased in FFY 2007. However, results are still very positive.

Display 8-2: Percent of Parents Who Report that the School Facilitated Their Involvement, Results Over Time

	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007
Total number of Parent respondents	1,738	4,887	1,509
Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	1,185	3,862	1,171
Percentage who reported school facilitated their involvement	68.2%	79.0%	77.6%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2006:

During the 2007-2008 school year, a review of the results from FFY 2006 indicated there were ten (10) school districts that did meet the state target. A review of those districts indicated that 7 of the 10 districts did not achieve 75% of total points or better to indicate that parents are involved in the special education process specific to the Questions 11 (3-5 year olds) and/or 30 (16 to 18 year olds). In reviewing the file reviews completed by the 7 districts, 4 of the districts had no compliance issues concerning their communication with parents, or with parent participation in the identification and IEP process. The other three districts had noncompliance issues specifically with transition age student, and parent participation in

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

transition planning. All 3 of those districts have completed corrective action plans to address the issues of parent participation in transition planning.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

The SPP for Indicator 8 has not been revised for this year.

Improvement Activities/Timelines

1. During the 2008-2009 school year the ILCD Facilitators will continue to work with those school districts who have not met the target. The Part B Parent Survey report will be shared with the individual district, and the ILCD Facilitator will provide follow up activities with districts which will coordinate with the district's ILCD activities. Results will be used to rate the district's performance on ILCD Inquiry 1 and Impact Area II.
2. The ILCD Facilitators are taking a lead role with districts in Year 4 of the Parent Survey cycle to ensure that districts are distributing the Parent Survey in their districts, gathering the results, and returning the results to the NDE Special Education Office, in a timely manner, since there were issues identified this last year which impeded the process.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Applied:

a. 0 districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

b. 254 districts in the State

a divided by b times 100 =0%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in <i>special education and related services</i> as the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

	Under-Representation	Over-Representation
Total number of LEAs (2006-2007)	254	254
# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0	0
% of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0%	0%
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0	0

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0%	0%
--	----	----

Step 1:

Nebraska used a weighted risk ratio of 2.00 to determine disproportionate over-representation and a weighted risk ratio of .25 to determine disproportionate under-representation. The weighted risk ratio is calculated only if there are 30 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 30 or more students in the comparison group. This minimum of 30 “n” corresponds to the minimum “n” size Nebraska uses for No Child Left Behind Reporting.

Nebraska identified 0 districts as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006 (as required by the OSEP June 2008 Response Table):

In its FFY 2006 APR, Nebraska reported that it had not yet completed its determination of whether disproportionate representation identified in the two school districts was the result of inappropriate identification.

~~Nebraska completed its review of the two districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and found that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification.~~

For each of the two districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, Nebraska conducted a review of the districts' policies and procedures associated with the identification of students with disabilities. Additionally, Nebraska conducted an on-site visit for the purpose of reviewing the standards contained in 92 NAC 51 and the related requirements contained in OSEP's Part B – SPP/APR Related Requirements document specifically associated with the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The on-site visit included the review of student files for compliance with these requirements. Following the completion of the review, Nebraska determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Nebraska's actual target data for FFY 2006 were 0%.

Correction of Noncompliance Related to Indicator 9:

As indicated above, no noncompliance was identified in FFY 2006 related to Indicator 9.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska's data for FFY 2007 on this indicator remain unchanged from its FFY 2006 data of 0%.

As directed by OSEP, Nebraska used the Technical Assistance (TA) material found at <http://spp-apr-calendar.rrfcnetwork.org/techassistance.html> for indicator 9. The Nebraska Department of Education Special Education office designated a team to review the materials and make recommendations. Upon review of the material, the team found that they were doing all the things laid out in the TA and that the TA

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

did not address the issue that Nebraska had in the FFY 2006 APR. Nebraska was unable to conduct a review of Policies and Procedures in a timely manner in FFY2006 and have since conducted those reviews and created a timeline for future reviews to ensure they are completed within the timelines of the APR.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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) (a) divided by the (# of districts in the State)(b)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Applied:

a. 0 districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

b. 254 districts in the State

a divided by b times 100 = 0%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in <i>specific disability categories</i> as the result of inappropriate identification.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

	Under-Representation	Over-Representation
Total number of LEAs (2006-2007)	254	254
# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0	3
% of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0%	1.18%
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0	0

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0%	0%
--	----	----

Step 1:

Nebraska used a weighted risk ratio of 2.00 to determine disproportionate over-representation and a weighted risk ratio of .25 to determine disproportionate under-representation. The weighted risk ratio is calculated only if there are 30 or more students in the group of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 30 or more students in the comparison group. This minimum of 30 “n” corresponds to the minimum “n” size Nebraska uses for No Child Left Behind Reporting.

Nebraska identified 3 districts as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Step 2:

A thorough review of the 3 LEAs identified in fiscal year 2007 as having disproportionate representation was conducted. The review included a review of policy and procedural manuals and student records using the Related Requirements Document developed by OSEP as well as looking at practices in the identified districts.

Nebraska found that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification in any of the school districts.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006 (as required by the OSEP June 2008 Response Table):

In its FFY 2006 APR, Nebraska reported that it had not yet completed its determination of whether disproportionate representation identified in the two school districts was the result of inappropriate identification.

~~Nebraska completed its review of the two districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and found that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification.~~

For each of the two districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, Nebraska conducted a review of the districts’ policies and procedures associated with the identification of students with disabilities. Additionally, Nebraska conducted an on-site visit for the purpose of reviewing the standards contained in 92 NAC 51 and the related requirements contained in OSEP’s Part B – SPP/APR Related Requirements document specifically associated with the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The on-site visit included the review of student files for compliance with these requirements. Following the completion of the review, Nebraska determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Nebraska’s actual target data for FFY 2006 were 0%.

Correction of Noncompliance Related to Indicator 10:

As indicated above, no noncompliance was identified in FFY 2006 related to Indicator 10.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska's data for FFY 2007 on this indicator remain unchanged from its FFY 2006 data of 0%.

As directed by OSEP, Nebraska used the Technical Assistance (TA) material found at <http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/techassistance.html> for indicator 10. The Nebraska Department of Education Special Education office designated a team to review the materials and make recommendations. Upon review of the material, the team found that they were doing all the things laid out in the TA and that the TA did not address the issue that Nebraska had in the FFY 2006 APR. Nebraska was unable to conduct a review of Policies and Procedures in a timely manner in FFY2006 and have since conducted those reviews and created a timeline for future reviews to ensure they are completed within the timelines of the APR.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 63 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b) or (c). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

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

Applied:

- a. 9146
- b. 2198
- c. 6089

[(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100 = 91%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007: 91%

A = 9146 total children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received

B = 2198 determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days, Nebraska's state established timeline.

C = 6089 determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days, Nebraska's state established timeline.

91% of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days. (Percent = (b+c) divided by (a) times 100)

9% of children with parental consent to evaluate were not evaluated and eligibility determined within the 60 days. The range of days to exceed the 60 days was 1 to 318 days. Of these the majority were between 1 and 84 days, three files exceeded the timeline by 110 days, and 1 file exceeded the

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

timeline by 318 days. The reasons for the delay were primarily student mobility, student availability and student health matters.

In addition, the 1 FFY 2005 finding that remained uncorrected in the FFY 2006 APR was corrected.

Correction of Noncompliance Related to Indicator 11:

(a) # of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006	(b) # of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
50 (findings are grouped by legal citation and District)	22	28	0

In addition to verifying correction of these findings of noncompliance, Nebraska also ensured that all children who did not receive an evaluation within the timeline received an evaluation.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska is reporting a slippage from 93.1% for FFY 2006 to 91% for FFY 2007. Review of the data indicated that the districts were missing the 60 calendar day timelines because the districts were not completing the process unless a MDT meeting had occurred, and school breaks and weather influenced the availability of parents. Larger districts appeared to struggle with mobility of students, school breaks, and parent availability, while smaller districts had problems with weather issues and the availability of students for testing.

As directed by OSEP, Nebraska used the Technical Assistance (TA) material found at http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/technical_assistance.html for Indicator 11. The Nebraska Department of Education, Special Education ILCD Team reviewed the data from the statewide data collection in October 2008, to identify the factors contributing to the noncompliance and recommended that the following plan be implemented as a corrective action.

Nebraska's timeline for determination of initial eligibility was changed effective August 30, 2008 from 60 calendar days to 45 school days. Improvement and correction activities included clarification to districts on the requirements for determination of eligibility, especially the requirement that the multidisciplinary team produce a written report within the required timeline, and that a MDT meeting is not required to complete the identification process. To document correction of noncompliance in meeting the timeline for determination of initial eligibility, sample data was reviewed to determine whether the districts were completing initial evaluations within the required timeline. Correction was subsequently verified in the 28 districts that exceeded the correction of noncompliance timeline in FFY 2006. This was verified through the collection of sample data, with 27 districts achieving 100%, and 1 district achieving 99.7%, for an overall compliance rate of 99.9%.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 68 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 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.

(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 eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were 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 who parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. 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)] times 100.

Applied:

- a. 501 Referred for Part B – 27 who exited for reasons other than not eligible for Part B services = 474
- b. 0 - Not eligible for Part B services.
- c. 465 Children who were referred and are receiving Part B services.
- d. 9 children whose parents refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services

[(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100 = 100%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children exiting Part C are eligible for Part B and will continue to be served, unless they completed their IFSP's or were exited because (1) they are deceased, (2) they moved out of state, (3) they were withdrawn by parent (or guardian), or (4) attempts to contact were unsuccessful.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

100% (465) of the children exiting Part C were eligible for Part B and will continue to be served.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Actual Data FFY 2007	
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	474
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.	0
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	465
d. # of children for who parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	9
465 (c) / (474-0-9) (a-b-d) X 100 =	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska's data for FFY 2007 on this indicator remain unchanged from its FFY 2006 data of 100%.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 73 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated; measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

Measurement: Percent= [# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals](a) divided by the (#of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)(b)] times 100.

Applied:

a. 335

b. 405

[a divided by b] times 100 = 82.7%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of youth age 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet their post-secondary goals.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007: 82.7%

Correction of Noncompliance Related to Indicator 13:

(a) # of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006	(b) # of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
85	79	6	0

Findings are reported by individual student file. A total of 85 individual student files did not meet the requirements of this indicator as reported in FFY 2006. Each file was verified as corrected.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska's data for this indicator represent progress from its FFY 2006 data of 81.3% to 82.7% in FFY 2007. While Nebraska did not meet the target on this indicator, the improvement activities resulted in an increase of 1.4%.

Nebraska used NSTTAC's *Indicator 13 Checklist A* questions to collect the data for this indicator.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 73 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 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.

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

Measurement:

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 (a) divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school (b) times 100.

Applied:

a. 1007

b. 1079

[a divided by b times 100] = 93.3%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	94.1% 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

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007: 93.3%

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 (a)	1007
Youth assessed who has IEPs and are no longer in secondary school (b)	1079
a divided by b X 100 =	93.3%

Representativeness of Actual Target Data:

The data collected as part of the Nebraska Post-School Outcomes Survey is representative of the target population. The raw data collected was compared to the student population to check for proportionality and certain differences, as anticipated, were present. For example, a larger proportion of students exiting with regular high school diplomas and a smaller proportion of students exiting by dropping out were interviewed compared to their respective populations. In order to adjust for these differences, weighting

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

was employed to statistically compensate for these differences and to allow generalizations to be made from the data.

The data were weighted by exit reason, gender, and race. Due to small sample sizes of individual racial/ethnic students, weighting was carried out by combining all students into two groups: racial/ethnic minority or non-racial/ethnic minority. As is common with survey research of similar methodology, minority students were somewhat under-represented in the overall group of completed interviews prior to weighting.

Additional tracking efforts will be made in future years to improve upon the inclusion of these students at more representative levels. Additionally, increased effort will be made to encourage schools in Nebraska who have higher minority populations to provide more detailed contact information to aide in tracking efforts.

Definitions used for this Indicator:

- Competitive Employment (Rehabilitation Act): Competitive Employment means work- (i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part-time basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not than less than customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled. (Authority: Sections 7(11) and 12(c) of the Act; 29 U.S.C. 705(11) and 709(c)) Nebraska Post-School Outcomes Project also recognizes supported employment as “Competitive Employment”.
- Postsecondary School: Continued education post-high school whether the enrollment is full or part time. Full-time enrollment is defined as attending 50% or greater time in the postsecondary school. Part-time enrollment is defined as attending less than 50% in the postsecondary school.
- Examples of postsecondary schools may include: two and four year colleges, service learning, apprenticeship, training/certificate programs. Postsecondary education includes any formal training that is not usually considered as “on-the-job training”.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

As actual target data for this Indicator falls within the margin of error (2.34) for a survey of this size, the results are considered to be similar from the previous year.

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 73 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

Applied:

- a. **2608** findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006 (2006-2007)
- b. **2413** findings in (a) for which correction was verified as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

[(b) divided by (a)] times 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of noncompliance issues identified through monitoring, complaints, or due process, were corrected and compliance met, within the one-year timeline.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

92.5% findings made in FFY 2006 were verified as corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

7.5% of findings made in FFY 2006 were subsequently verified as corrected within 3 months of the one year timeline. These 195 findings were in 31 school districts and were corrected within 3 months of the one year timeline

In addition, the 198 FFY 2005 findings in the four school districts that remained uncorrected in the FFY 2006 APR were corrected.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska’s monitoring process, Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD), is described in detail in Nebraska’s SPP. As part of ILCD, Nebraska identified findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006 using multiple components of its general supervision system including cyclical monitoring and reviewing collected data.

Nebraska modified the OSEP Indicator 15 worksheet to align with Nebraska’s impact areas. The impact areas were developed with broad stakeholder involvement and tie together related SPP and APR indicators, ILCD inquiries, and other related requirements and activities to enable NDE and its districts to look at the SPP and APR indicators within the bigger picture of improving achievement and accountability for children and youth with disabilities.

Nebraska used the following definitions for this indicator:

Finding:

A written notification from the State to an LEA or service agency that includes a conclusion that the LEA or service agency is in noncompliance, the citation of the statute or regulation, and a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data supporting the conclusion that there is noncompliance. For SPP and APR indicators, ILCD inquiries, and dispute resolution findings for which correction can be completed for individual instances, Nebraska reports each instance of noncompliance as a finding. For SPP and APR indicators, ILCD inquiries, and dispute resolution findings for which correction cannot be completed for individual instances (i.e., timelines), Nebraska groups individual instances of noncompliance into one finding for which the district must demonstrate compliance.

Verification of Correction:

Nebraska requires the correction of all instances of noncompliance. For SPP and APR indicators, ILCD inquiries, and dispute resolution findings for which correction can be completed for individual instances, the LEA or service agency must demonstrate that it has corrected each individual instance. To verify correction and for SPP and APR indicators, ILCD inquiries, and dispute resolution findings for which correction cannot be completed for individual instances, Nebraska conducts a review of additional files or data, as appropriate, to ensure compliance following the implementation of a corrective action plan.

Part B Indicator 15 Worksheet						
		# of LEAs and service agencies monitored in FFY 2006	(a) # of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006	(b) # of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
Impact Area 1: Improving Academic Achievement, Functional Outcomes and Child Outcomes in Natural and	Findings made through ILCD	254	1841	1721	120	0

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Part B Indicator 15 Worksheet

		# of LEAs and service agencies monitored in FFY 2006	(a) # of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006	(b) # of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
Inclusive Environments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 1 – Graduation Indicator 3 – Assessment Indicator 7 – Outcomes Indicator 5 – LRE Indicator 6 – Preschool LRE Indicators 9 and 10 – Disproportionate Representation Related ILCD Inquiries 	Findings made through dispute resolution	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Area 2: Improving Communication and Relationships Among Families, Schools, Communities and Agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 2 – Dropout Indicator 4 – Suspension and Expulsion Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement Indicator 11 – 45 School days for Initial Evaluation Related ILCD Inquiries 	Findings made through ILCD	254	617	548	69	0
	Findings made through dispute resolution	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Area 3: Improving Transitions from the Early Development Network to Preschool and School to Adult Living: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 12 – Part C to B Transition Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition Related ILCD Inquiries 	Findings made through ILCD	254	150	144	6	0
	Findings made through dispute resolution	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Area 4: Improving Accountability and General Supervision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispute Resolution 	Findings made through ILCD	254	0	0	0	0

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Part B Indicator 15 Worksheet						
		# of LEAs and service agencies monitored in FFY 2006	(a) # of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006	(b) # of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was subsequently verified	# of findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction has not been verified
Processes • Indicator 20 – Timely and Accurate Data • Related ILCD Inquiries	Findings made through dispute resolution	0	0	0	0	0
Total			2608	2413	195	

The 195 findings for which correction was subsequently verified were in 31 school districts. As directed by OSEP, Nebraska used the Technical Assistance (TA) material found at http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/technical_assistance.html for Indicator 15. The Nebraska Department of Education, Special Education ILCD staff completed the corrective action plan activities with those school districts Nebraska who had not met the timelines by implementing and completing the following activities:

LEA #1 through LEA #4 (Completion of CAP from file reviews, complaints or due process) – The CAP was completed, and follow-up with each of the schools districts were completed within 3 months of the timeline. Correction of noncompliance was verified and documented through a CAP Completion report and the Closeout letter to the district.

LEA #4 through LEA #31 (100% compliance with timeline for MDT) - Nebraska's timeline for determination of initial eligibility was changed effective August 30, 2008 from 60 calendar days to 45 school days. Improvement and correction activities included clarification to districts on the requirements for determination of eligibility, especially the requirement that the multidisciplinary team produce a written report, and that a MDT meeting is not required to complete the identification process. To document the effect of the timeline change to 45 school days, and to provide districts an opportunity to subsequently correct noncompliance in meeting the timeline for determination of initial eligibility, districts that performed at less than 100% in October 2007, and had not met the one year timeline for correction of noncompliance were asked to collect data on initial evaluations begun on or after August 30, 2008, and completed on or before November 30, 2008. The FFY 2006 findings in 28 districts, that exceeded the correction of noncompliance timeline, were subsequently corrected through the collection of this sample data, with 27 districts achieving 100%, and 1 district achieving 99.7%, for an overall compliance rate of 99.9%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska demonstrated progress in FFY 2007 by moving from 92.2% of noncompliance issues identified through monitoring, complaints, or due process, were corrected and compliance met, within the one year timeline in FFY 2006 to 92.5% in FFY 2007. While Nebraska did not meet the target for FFY 2007, the improvement activities resulted in an increase of .3%

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 76 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

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

Applied: [(1+ 1) divided by 2] times 100 = 100%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within the established timeline (60 days or extended timeline for exceptional circumstances).</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within the established timeline (60 days or extended timeline for exceptional circumstances).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska’s data for FFY 2007 on this indicator remain unchanged from its FFY 2006 data of 100%.

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 76 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement: Percent = $[(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) \text{ divided by } 3.2] \text{ times } 100.$

Applied: $[(0 + 1) \text{ divided by } 1] \text{ times } 100 = 100\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests are resolved within the established timelines (45-day timeline or a timeline that is property extended by the hearing officer.)</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were resolved within the established timelines (45-day timeline or a timeline that is property extended by the hearing officer.)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska cannot determine progress or slippage because no fully adjudicated due process hearings were resolved in FFY 2006.

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 76 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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.

Applied: (0 divided by 0) times 100 = 0

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>The state will provide baseline targets and improvement activities in any FFY in which 10 or more resolution sessions are held.</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007:

No resolution sessions were held in FFY 2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska cannot determine progress or slippage because no resolution sessions were held in FFY 2006.

Nebraska’s discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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.

Applied:

Percent = [(0 + 5) divided by 8] times 100 = 62.5%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	69% of mediations will result in mediation agreements.

Actual Target Data for 2007-2008: 62.5% (See Table 7)

Mediation requests total	11
Mediations held	8
Mediations held related to due process complaints	0
Mediation agreements	0
Mediations held not related to due process complaints	8
Mediation agreements	5
Mediations not held (including pending)	3
Mediation agreements (5) / Mediations held (8) X 100 =	62.5%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007

Nebraska cannot determine progress or slippage because fewer than ten mediations were held in FFY 2006.

62.5% of mediations resulted in mediated agreements. This is a decrease in performance and does not reach the target of 68%. (Since there were less than 10 mediated agreements, the statistical reliability of this data is questionable and should be used cautiously.) There were eleven requests for mediation within

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

the relevant timeframe. Eight mediation sessions were conducted and of those five resulted in written mediation agreements. In three cases mediations were not held.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included on page 76 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2007

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (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 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 February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

Applied:

- a. 43/43 Points
 - b. 39/43 Points
- 82/86 Total points x 100 = 95.35%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of state-reported data will be submitted in a timely and accurate manner.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2007: 95.35%

Nebraska used the Indicator 20 rubric to determine the actual target data for FFY 2007.

Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric

Part B Indicator 20 - SPP/APR Data			
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
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

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	1	1	2		
16	1	1	2		
17	1	1	2		
18	1	1	2		
19	1	1	2		
		Subtotal	38		
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)		5		
	Grand Total		43		
Part B Indicator 20 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	4 0	1	-4 3
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/08	1	0	4 0	N/A	2 1
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	4 0	1	-4 3
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/08	1	0	4 0	N/A	2 1
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/09	1	4 N/A	4 N/A	N/A	3 1
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	24 15
				Weighted Total (subtotal X 1.87; round ≤.49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)	39 28
Indicator #20 Calculation					
			A. APR Total	43	43
			B. 618 Total	43	39 28
			C. Grand	86	82

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

			Total	(- 3.74 N/A 618 = 82.26)	71
Percent of timely and accurate data = (C divided by 86 times 100)			(C) / (86) X 100 =		95.35 86.4

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2007:

Nebraska's Timely and Accurate data submissions increased from its FFY 2006 data of 92.8% to 95.35% in FFY 2007. While Nebraska did not meet the target of 100%, the improvement activities resulted in an increased performance of 2.55%.

Nebraska's discussion of the improvement activities implemented during FFY 2007 and their impact on the data reported in this indicator is included on page 76 of the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2007:

Nebraska reviewed and revised its improvement activities for this indicator including adding additional improvement activities. The revised improvement activities are included in the Impact Areas Improvement Strategies document, attached.

Attachment 1

Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities: Impact Areas and Strategies for Improvement

Note: This attachment to Nebraska's FFY 2007 Annual Performance Report (APR) is a summary of improvement activities implemented in 2007-2008 for each APR Indicator. The indicators for Part B and Part C are clustered into "Impact Areas" and improvement strategies identified by stakeholder groups as the focus of effort for Nebraska providers in the areas of special education and early intervention. The development and rationale for this approach is explained in this companion document, "Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities: Impact Areas and Improvement Strategies."

Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities: Impact Areas and Strategies for Improvement

The Development and Rationale for the Impact Areas

As an outgrowth of stakeholder input across the state, Nebraska sought to arrange the indicators of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the Annual Performance Report (APR) into clusters to increase awareness of the inter-relatedness of the indicators and to show how the SPP indicators relate to the inquiries of Nebraska's Department of Education (NDE) monitoring system, Improving Learning for Children (ILCD).

The process to develop these clusters included several meetings of a stakeholder group to design the concept, which resulted in four Impact Areas as the focus of effort for Nebraska providers in the areas of special education and early intervention. Four smaller groups formed to better develop the ideas and define improvement strategies for each Impact Area.

Nebraska providers in the areas of special education and early intervention include NDE, the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)—the co-lead agency for Part C, the educational service units (ESUs), school districts, and local early intervention programs (the Early Development Network-EDN). Grouping related SPP indicators and ILCD inquiries into meaningful categories provides an overview that enables these providers to look at the bigger picture of improving outcomes and accountability rather than a piecemeal process of indicator-by-indicator or inquiry-by-inquiry. As data is clustered around a broad impact area, decisions are made based on the number of data points rather than from a single data point in isolation. The Impact Areas create an overarching umbrella that ties together the SPP indicators for Part B and C, the ILCD inquiries, Determinations, and public reporting into categories for targeted improvement. The projected outcome is improved results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.

The Four Impact Areas and Strategies for Improvement

Nebraska organized the SPP indicators, the APR improvement activities, and the ILCD inquiries into four Impact Areas that tie together the various data collections and improvement processes into one system. Analysis of the previous SPP targets and the APR improvement activities found that many of the activities were repeated across indicators and some focused on improving data quality and general supervision rather than the results and outcomes identified by the indicators. Clustering related indicators and inquiries groups the data and presents a clearer, more comprehensive picture of overall performance and outcomes. Defining strategies for improvement in each impact area allows the state, school districts, and early intervention programs to focus professional development efforts on options that relate to overall improvement of programs for children with disabilities.

This document contains all of the improvement activities from the FFY 2007 APR. The indicators and their improvement activities are clustered into the four Impact Areas that were identified as the focus for Nebraska providers in the area of special education and early intervention:

- Impact Area 1: Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes in natural and inclusive environments
- Impact Area 2: Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies
- Impact Area 3: Improving transitions from the Early Development Network to preschool and from school to adult living
- Impact Area 4: Improving accountability and general supervision.

APR Template – Part B (4)

Nebraska
State

The four strategies identified to focus the development of improvement activities are:

- Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support
- Strategy 2: Technical assistance and professional development
- Strategy 3: Collaboration with agency partners
- Strategy 4: Program development

Reporting for the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports

The development of impact areas streamlines all improvement activities into one continuous improvement system. This assists school districts and early intervention programs in focusing on strategies for improvement that will impact multiple indicators rather than attempting to implement separate activities for each indicator. While Nebraska recognizes that the strategies it will implement under each impact area may affect all indicators, for purposes of reporting for the SPP and the APR, the indicators have been placed in a single impact area as agreed upon by stakeholders.

The Part B and Part C indicators are arranged as follows:

Impact Area 1: Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes in natural and inclusive environments

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| B-1: Graduation | C-1: Timely Service Delivery |
| B-3: Statewide Assessment | C-2: Settings |
| B-5: LRE Placement | C-3: Child Outcomes |
| B-6: Preschool Settings | C-7: Evaluation and IFSP in 45 days |
| B-7: Preschool Skills | |
| B-9: Disproportionality-SPED (i.e., representation in Special Education) | |
| B-10: Disproportionality-Category (i.e., representation in Specific Disability Categories) | |

Impact Area 2: Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| B-2: Dropout | C-4: Family Outcomes |
| B-4: Suspension/Expulsion | C-5: Child Find, Birth-1 |
| B-8: Parent Involvement | C-6: Child Find, Birth-3 |
| B-11: Child Find | |

Impact Area 3: Improving transitions from the Early Development Network to preschool and from school to adult living

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| B-12: Part C to B Transition | C-8: Early Childhood Transition |
| B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP Goals | |
| B-14: Post-School Outcomes | |

Impact Area 4: Improving accountability and general supervision

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| B-15: Correction of Noncompliance | C-9: Correction of Noncompliance |
| B-16: Written Complaints | C-10: Written Complaints |
| B-17: Due Process Hearings | C-11: Due Process Hearings |
| B-18: Resolution Sessions | C-12: Resolution Sessions |
| B-19: Mediations | C-13: Mediations |
| B-20: Timely and Accurate Data | C-14: Timely and Accurate Data |

In this companion document, Nebraska will report the improvement activities it has completed in each impact area, show their effects on the related SPP targets and outline the revisions and additions to Nebraska's improvement activities that will accompany the annual submission of the APR and SPP revisions.

Impact Area 1

Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes in natural and inclusive environments

Strategies and Improvement Activities Implemented in FFY 2007 for Impact Area 1:

Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support

- Collection and analysis of data related to graduation rates, participation in statewide assessments, least restrictive environments, and disproportionality.

Indicators

B-1: Graduation
B-3: Assessment
B-5: LRE Placement
B-9,10: Disproportionality

Strategy 2: Technical assistance and professional development

- Development and dissemination of technical assistance materials outlining practices for improving graduation rates, participation in state wide assessments, least restrictive environments, disproportionality, and Response to Intervention (RtI).
- Provision of technical assistance and professional development to districts/communities at the local level on topics related to graduation rates, appropriate assessments, LRE for low incidence disabilities, disproportionality and RtI.
- Dissemination of technical assistance materials and resources to assist professionals and families with requirements and evidence-based practices regarding provision of services and supporting documentation in the following areas: delivery of timely services, providing services in home and community settings, functional child outcomes and the meeting the 45-day MDT/IFSP time line.

B-1: Graduation
B-3: Assessment
B-5: LRE Placement
B-9,10: Disproportionality

B-1: Graduation
B-3: Assessment
B-5: LRE Placement
B-9,10: Disproportionality

B-7: Preschool Skills
C-1: Timely Service Delivery
C-2: Settings
C-3: Child Outcomes
C-7: Evaluation /IFSP in 45 days

Strategy 3: Collaboration with agency partners

- Collaboration with policy partners and stakeholders to increase graduation rates by working with the National Drop Out Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities, the Community of Practice and the Youth Leadership Council for guidance and support.
- Cross-team collaboration at the state level in the area of assessment literacy and Response to Intervention
- Collaboration with stakeholders to define and determine measurement standards for disproportionate representation in special education
- Collaboration with local agencies to assure delivery of timely services and meeting the 45-day MDT/IFSP time line.

B-1: Graduation

B-3: Assessment
B-5: LRE Placement
B-9,10: Disproportionality

B-9,10: Disproportionality

C-1: Timely Service Delivery
C-7: Evaluation /IFSP in 45 days

Strategy 4: Program development

- Identification of processes and procedures to guide the implementation of RtI
- Ongoing implementation of the state's framework and work plan for child outcomes known as Results Matter

B-5: LRE Placement
B-9,10: Disproportionality

B-7: Preschool Skills
C-3: Child Outcomes

**Impact Area 1:
Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes
in natural and inclusive environments.**

Impact of Improvement Activities on Indicator Targets in FFY2007 for Impact Area 1:

B-1: Graduation

The graduation rate increased from 66.92% in FFY2006 to 71.63% in FFY2007. While Nebraska did not meet its proposed target of 74.9%, the progress represents an increase of 4.71%.

B-3: Assessment–3A

Nebraska demonstrated slippage from 72.13% in FFY2006 to 53.03% in FFY2007, a decrease of 15.21%. In FFY2007 state achievement levels in math and reading increased at all grade levels. While the achievement levels for the subgroup of student with disabilities continues to improve, the increases did not keep pace with Nebraska's proposed targets.

B-3: Assessment–3B

Nebraska demonstrated slippage from 97.22% for math and 98.14% for reading in FFY2006 to 96.59% for math and 97.56% for reading in FFY2007. The slippage represents a decrease of .64% in math and .58% in reading.

B-3: Assessment–3C

Nebraska demonstrated progress in FFY 2007:

- Elementary math proficiency increased from 75.45% in FFY2006 to 80.25% in FFY2007. This represents an increase of 4.80%
- Elementary reading proficiency increased from 71.14% in FFY2006 to 76.31% in FFY2007. This represents an increase of 5.17%.
- Middle School math proficiency increased from 64.85% in FFY2006 to 70.63% in FFY2007. This represents an increase of 5.78%.
- Middle School reading proficiency increased from 68.86% in FFY 2006 to 72.76% in FFY2007. This represents an increase of 3.90%.
- High School math proficiency increased from 55.90% in FFY2006 to 60.18% in FFY2007. This represents an increase of 4.28%.
- High School reading proficiency rose from 65.76% in FFY2006 to 70.85% in FFY2007. This represents an increase of 5.09%.

B-5A, B, C: LRE Placement

Nebraska demonstrated progress and met proposed targets in areas B-5A, B-5B, and B-5C. Data for Indicator B-5C showed improvement from 3.78% of students served in separate and outside placements in FFY 2006 to 2.52% in FFY2007.

B-7: Preschool Skills

Nebraska is not required to report on this indicator.

B-9: Disproportionality -SPED

Nebraska's data for this indicator remain unchanged in FFY2007 from its FFY2006 data of 0%.

B-10: Disproportionality -Category

Nebraska's data for this indicator remain unchanged in FFY2007 from its FFY2006 data of 0%.

C-1: Timely Service Delivery

Nebraska continued to meet the target of 100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. This remains unchanged from FFY2006

**Impact Area 1:
Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes
in natural and inclusive environments.**

C-2: Settings

Nebraska's data for provision of early intervention services in the home or community-based settings is 96.03% for FFY2007, which is less than the 99.04% reported in FFY2006.

C-3: Child outcomes

Nebraska is not required to report on this indicator.

C-7: Evaluation/ IFSP-45 days

Nebraska's data shows improvement from 61.36% in FFY2006 to 92.23% in FFY2007.

Ongoing and Future Strategies and Improvement Activities for Impact Area 1:

Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support

Activity 1.	Monitor baseline data each year for multi-year trend patterns for graduation rates, academic achievement, LRE placement functional outcomes and child outcomes.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-1: Graduation B-3: Assessment B-5: LRE Placement B-7: Preschool Skills B-9,10: Disproportionality C-3: Child outcomes
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	

Strategy 2: Technical assistance and professional development

Activity 1.	Disseminate resources and provide technical assistance and professional development opportunities to support school districts in school improvement through data collection, program development, scientifically-based and culturally competent practices.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-1: Graduation B-3: Assessment B-5: LRE Placement B-9,10: Disproportionality
	<i>Status:</i>	Revised FFY 2007 to broaden scope of activity	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	
Activity 2.	Disseminate resources and provide training and technical assistance in a variety of venues to assist professionals, families and others as appropriate with requirements and evidence-based practices regarding provision of services and supporting documentation in the following areas: delivery of timely services, providing services in home and community settings, 45-day evaluation time line, and child outcomes.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-7: Preschool Skills C-1: Timely Service Delivery C-2: Settings C-3: Child outcomes C-7: Evaluation/IFSP-45 days
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	

**Impact Area 1:
Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes
in natural and inclusive environments.**

Strategy 3: Collaboration with agency partners

Activity 1.	Collaborate with various stakeholders and other offices within NDE to plan and provide technical assistance and professional development opportunities to support school districts in school improvement through data collection, program development, scientifically-based and culturally competent practices.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-1: Graduation B-3: Assessment B-5: LRE Placement B-9,10: Disproportionality
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With stakeholder input, NDE has identified the Response to Intervention (Rtl) framework, including the implementation of the Essential Elements for Rtl, inclusion and early literacy activities as the focus of technical assistance and staff development for schools not meeting state targets for academic achievement and functional outcomes. 		
	<i>Status:</i> Revised 2007 to broaden scope of activity. Continuing		
	<i>Timeline:</i> 2008-2010		

Strategy 4: Program development

Activity 1.	Continue the implementation of the state's framework and work plan for child outcomes known as Results Matters. This includes requiring each LEA to implement an interrater reliability plan to ensure quality assurance and monitoring procedures.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-7: Preschool skills C-3: Child outcomes
	<i>Status:</i> Continuing		
	<i>Timeline:</i> 2008-2010		

Resources for Strategies and Improvement Activities for Impact Area 1:

Resources:	Strategy: Activity:	1	2	3	4
		1	1	2	1
Answers4Families				X	
Education Service Units (ESUs)					
Colorado Department of Education					X
Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Committee		X	X		X
Early Development Network Co-Lead agencies				X	X
Early Development Network Services Coordinators				X	X
GSEG					X

**Impact Area 1:
Improving academic achievement, functional outcomes and child outcomes
in natural and inclusive environments.**

Resources:	Strategy:	1	2		3	4
	Activity:	1	1	2	1	1
GSEG/AA-MAS			X		X	
Head Start						X
Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD)		X	X		X	
Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC)			X	X		
Munroe-Meyer Institute						X
Nebraska Association of Special Education Supervisors (NASES)						X
NDE/ESU Facilitators						X
NDE Offices of: Assessment, Curriculum/Instruction, Title I, Early Childhood, School Improvement, and Special Education		X	X		X	
NECTAC						X
Nebraska Student and Staff Record System (NSSRS)		X	X		X	
Planning Region Teams				X		X
PTI-Nebraska				X		X
Results Matter State Management Team and Measurement Task Force						X
Response to Intervention (Rtl) Consortium			X		X	
Special Education Advisory Committee		X	X		X	
SOSR		X				
State Rtl SEAC Standing Committee		X	X		X	
State Transition Advisory Committee		X				

Impact Area 2

Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies

Strategies and Improvement Activities Implemented in FFY2007 for Impact Area 2:

Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support

- Analysis of data reported to the state to demonstrate district and PRT level performance in the areas of dropout, suspension/expulsion, parent involvement, family outcomes, and Child Find.
- Distribution of Parent/Family surveys to all stakeholders.

Indicators

B-2: Dropout
B-4: Suspension/Expulsion
B-8: Parent Involvement
B-11: Child Find
C-4: Family Outcomes
C-5: Child Find, Birth-1
C-6: Child Find, Birth-3

B-8: Parent Involvement
C-4: Family Outcomes

Strategy 2: Technical assistance and professional development

- Development and dissemination of technical assistance materials and professional development resources directed toward districts who did not meet state targets in the areas of dropout and suspension/expulsion.
- Development and dissemination of technical assistance materials and resources at district, ESU and PRT levels to assist stakeholders with program improvement and best practice specific to improving dropout rates, parent involvement, family outcomes and Child Find.

B-2: Dropout
B-4: Suspension/Expulsion
B-11: Child Find

B-2: Dropout
B-8: Parent Involvement
B-11: Child Find
C-4: Family Outcomes
C-5: Child Find, Birth-1
C-6: Child Find, Birth-3

Strategy 3: Collaboration with agency partners

- Collaboration with policy partners and stakeholders to decrease school dropout rates by working with the National Dropout Prevention Center, Community of Practice (CoP) and the Youth Leadership Council.
- Collaboration with state and community groups to develop and enhance a referral process to identify infants and toddlers with disabilities specific to CAPTA and Early Hearing Detection and Intervention legislative mandates.

B-2: Dropout

C-5: Child Find, Birth-1
C-6: Child Find, Birth-3

Strategy 4: Program development

- Revisions to the Planning Region Team Systems Support/Change Grant process to focus on regional program development.
- Improving the referral and verification processes to identify and provide services for infants and toddlers with hearing loss and substantiated cases of abuse and neglect.

C-5: Child Find, Birth-1
C-6: Child Find, Birth-3

C-5: Child Find, Birth-1
C-6: Child Find, Birth-3

Impact Area 2

**Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies
Impact of Improvement Activities on Indicator Targets in FFY2007 for Impact Area 2:**

B-2: Dropout

Nebraska's data shows a decrease in the dropout rate 3.98% in FFY2006 to 3.83% in FFY2007. While Nebraska did not meet its target of 2.36%, the improvement activities resulted in an increase in performance of .15%.

B-4: Suspension/ Expulsion

All Nebraska schools met the target in FFY2007, which represents progress from FFY2006 when two school districts did not meet the target.

B-8: Parent involvement

The percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement decreased from 79.0% in FFY2006 to 77.6% in FFY2007. This represents a decrease of 1.4%.

The percentage of parents who reported that the school facilitated their involvement increased from FFY 2005 to FFY 2006 and then slightly decreased in FFY 2007. However, results are still very positive.

B-11: Child Find

Nebraska's data shows slippage from 93.1% in FFY2006 to 91% in FFY2007, which represents a decrease of 2.1%. Review of the data indicated that the districts were missing the 60 calendar day timelines because the districts were not completing the process unless a MDT meeting had occurred, and school breaks and weather influenced the availability of parents.

C-4A, C-4B, C4-C: Family Outcomes

Nebraska's data shows improvement for families who report families know their rights (C-4A) and help their children develop and learn (C-4C) from 74% and 84%, respectively, in FFY2006 to 74.8% and 88.3%, respectively, in FFY2007; data shows slippage for families who they effectively communicate their children's needs (C-4B) from 71% in FFY2006 to 69.9% in FFY2007.

C-5: Child Find B-1

Nebraska's data for the number of children ages birth to one with IFSPs shows an increase from 0.71% in FFY2006 to 0.78% in FFY2007.

C-6: Child Find B-3

Nebraska's data on the number of children ages birth to three with IFSPs remains unchanged in FFY2007 from the 1.74% reported in FFY2006.

Ongoing and Future Strategies and Improvement Activities for Impact Area 2:

Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support

Activity 1.	Continue data analysis and system supports in the areas of school dropout, suspension/expulsion, parent involvement, family outcomes, and Child Find.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-2: Dropout B-4: Suspension/Expulsion B-8: Parent Involvement B-11: Child Find C-4: Family outcomes C-5: Child Find, Birth-1 C-6: Child Find, Birth-3
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	

Impact Area 2

Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies

Strategy 2: Technical assistance and professional development

Activity 1.	Continue to provide technical assistance and professional development to districts not meeting state targets, to improve programs at the local level and improve dropout rates, suspension and expulsion rates, parent involvement, family outcomes, and Child Find.	<i>Indicators:</i> B-2: Dropout B-4: Suspension/Expulsion B-8: Parent involvement B-11: Child Find C-4: Family outcomes C-5: Child Find, Birth-1 C-6: Child Find, Birth-3				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During 2008-09 stakeholders will identify a statewide communication and relationship improvement strategy. 					
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010
<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.					
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					
Activity 2.	Continue to provide technical assistance and professional development to decrease school dropout rates, suspension and expulsions, and to improve communication and positive relationships to increase parent involvement, family outcomes, and Child Find.	<i>Indicators:</i> B-2: Dropout B-4: Suspension/Expulsion B-8: Parent involvement B-11: Child Find C-4: Family outcomes C-5: Child Find, Birth-1 C-6: Child Find, Birth-3				
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010
	<i>Status:</i>		Continuing			
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010		
<i>Status:</i>	Continuing					
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					

Strategy 3: Collaboration with agency partners

Activity 1.	Continue collaboration and assistance through Parent Encouraging Parents (PEP) Conference to support family involvement.	<i>Indicators:</i> B-8: Parent involvement				
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010
	<i>Status:</i>		Continuing.			
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010		
<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.					
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					
Activity 2.	Continue to collaborate with and promote collaboration between the Early Development Network (EDN) and Child Protection and Safety workers on CAPTA issues, and between EDN and the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention program.	<i>Indicators:</i> C-5: Child Find, Birth-1 C-6: Child Find, Birth-3				
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010
	<i>Status:</i>		Continuing.			
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Status:</i></td> <td>Continuing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Timeline:</i></td> <td>2008-2010</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010		
<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.					
<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010					

Impact Area 2
Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies

Strategy 4: Program development

Activity 1.	Continue program development to enhance positive behavior supports (PBS) within schools through Nebraska's-State Improvement Grant (NSIG)/General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG).		<i>Indicators:</i> B-2: Dropout B-4: Suspension/Expulsion
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	
Activity 2.	Build ChildFind through system support with Planning Region Teams.		<i>Indicators:</i> C-5: Child Find, Birth-1 C-6: Child Find, Birth-3
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing.	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2007-2010	

Resources for Improvement Strategies and Activities for Impact Area 2:

Resources:	Strategy:		3		4	
	1	2	1	2	1	2
Child Protection and Safety (CPS) workers				X		
Early Childhood Interagency Coordinating Council (ECICC)	X	X	X			
EDN Co-Lead Staff (NDE and DHHS)	X	X	X	X	X	X
Early Hearing and Detection Intervention (EHDI) program			X	X		
Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD) Facilitators	X	X	X		X	
Nebraska Department of Education (NDE)	X		X		X	
NSIG/GSEG						
Parents Encouraging Parents (PEP)			X	X		

Impact Area 2

Improving communication and relationships among families, schools, communities and agencies

Planning Region Teams (PRTs)	X	X		X	X		X
PTI-Nebraska		X	X	X			

Impact Area 3

Improving Transitions from the Early Development Network to Preschool and School to Adult Living

Strategies and Improvement Activities Implemented in FFY2007:

Strategy 2: Technical assistance and professional development

- Development and dissemination of technical assistance materials outlining transition requirements and reporting.
- Dissemination of resources that are available at the ESU and PRT levels to assist stakeholders with transition requirements and best practice (i.e. Secondary Transition Specialists, Early Intervention Services Coordinators, Service Providers, PTI-Nebraska)

Indicators

B-12: Part C to Part B Transition
B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP
B-14: Post-School Outcomes
C-8: Early Childhood Transition

B-12: Part C to Part B Transition
B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP
B-14: Post-School Outcomes
C-8: Early Childhood Transition

Strategy 3: Collaboration with agency partners

- Continued cross-team collaboration at the state level to strengthen transition programs for children ages birth through 21 (i.e. Early Childhood Special Education, Head Start, Department of Health and Human Services {DHHS}), Vocational Rehabilitation, and Career Education).
- Development of state Youth Leadership Council (NDE Office of Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation) to enhance youth leadership skills and serve as in advisory capacity for state transition teams.

B-12: Part C to Part B Transition
B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP
B-14: Post-School Outcomes
C-8: Early Childhood Transition

B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP
B-14: Post-School Outcomes

Impact of Improvement Activities on APR Indicator Targets in FFY2007 for Impact Area 3:

B-12: Part C to Part B Transition

Data supports improvement activities have maintained and supported 100% compliance for those children exiting Part C who are eligible for Part B and continue to be served.

B-13: Secondary Transition with IEP

The number of files completed for students ages 16 and older to include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services improved from 81.3% in FFY2006 to 82.7% in FFY2007.

Nebraska's review of data shows improvement from FFY2006 to FFY2007 in including measurable postsecondary goals, based upon age-appropriate transition assessments in the IEP. Also, the data presents a continued need to address the requirement of teams to invite (with the consent of the parent) agencies that may be providing or paying for a service.

B-14: Post-School Outcomes

By implementing the collection of post-school outcomes data for students that exited high school, Nebraska discovered that in FFY2007, 93.3% of former students contacted had been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. This number is slightly lower than the percentage reported in FFY2006 (94.1%) but since the margin of error for these percentages overlap there is no evidence of a

Impact Area 3:

Improving transitions from the Early Development Network to preschool and from school to adult living

significant change from FFY2006.

C-8A, C-8B, C-8C: Early Childhood Transition

Nebraska's data shows 100% compliance for 8-B (notification to LEA) and 8-C (provision of a transition conference for children potentially eligible for Part B); the IFSP files reviewed for 8-A (transition steps and services) showed improvement from 50% in FFY2006 to 55.4% in FFY2007.

Ongoing and Future Strategies and Improvement Activities:

Strategy 2: Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Activity 1.	Continue to provide technical assistance and professional development, including the person-centered planning process, to districts not meeting state targets to improve transition programs at the local level.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-12: Part C to Part B Transition B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP B-14: Post-School Outcomes
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	
Activity 2.	Provide training and technical assistance in a variety of venues, such as with school districts, PRTs, Services Coordinators, families, and others as appropriate, about providing transition services, and correctly documenting steps, services, and notification on the transition plan.		<i>Indicators:</i> C-8: Early Childhood Transition
	<i>Status:</i>	Revised FFY2007 to expand scope.	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	

Strategy 3: Collaborate with agency partners

Activity 1.	Collaborate with stakeholders to develop and organize the Nebraska Youth Leadership Council.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP B-14: Post-School Outcomes
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	2008-2010	
Activity 2.	Continue cross-team collaboration at the state level to strengthen transition programs for children ages birth through 21.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-12: Part C to Part B Transition B-13: Secondary Transition w/IEP B-14: Post-School Outcomes C-8: Early Childhood Transition
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	

**Impact Area 3:
Improving transitions from the Early Development Network to preschool and from school to adult living**

	Timeline: 2008-2010	
--	---------------------	--

Resources for Improvement Strategies and Activities

Resources:	Strategy:	2		3	
	Activity:	1	2	1	2
Career Education (NDE)					X
DHHS		X			X
Early Childhood Special Education (NDE)					X
ECICC			X		
EDN Co-Lead agencies			X		
Head Start					X
ILCD Facilitators		X	X		
MPRRC		X	X		
NDE		X		X	
NECTAC			X		
NPSO		X			
NSTTAC		X			
PTI-Nebraska		X	X		
School District Staff			X		
SEAC				X	
Vocational Rehabilitation (NDE)				X	X

Impact Area 4:

Improving accountability and general supervision

Strategies and Improvement Activities Implemented in FFY 2007 for Impact Area 4:

- To increase the effectiveness of the monitoring process and insure correction of noncompliance within one year:

Strategy 1: Data Analysis and System Support

- Modification of the ILCDC website to include a method to track the correction of noncompliance from all sources in a timely manner
- Merging Part B-C monitoring systems

B-15: Correction of Noncompliance

B-15: Correction of Noncompliance

Strategy 2: Technical Assistance and Professional Development

- Development and dissemination of a technical assistance document outlining the corrective action process

Indicators

B-15: Correction of Noncompliance

- To increase the effectiveness of the dispute resolution process:

Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support

- Monitoring the timeframe in which mediation, complaints and due process cases were completed.
- Development of additional data collection procedures for resolution sessions and mediation
- Development and implementation of training on the benefits of mediation and the resolution process

Indicators

B-16: Written Complaints
B-17: Due Process Hearings
B-19: Mediations

B-18: Resolution Sessions
B-19: Mediations

B-18: Resolution Sessions
B-19: Mediations

Strategy 2: Technical Assistance and Professional Development

- Implementation of training or revision of procedures in the event the established timeframes were exceeded.

B-16: Written Complaints
B-17: Due Process Hearings

- To continue the collection of timely and accurate data:

Strategy 1: Data analysis and system support

- Incorporating a 10% flagging system into data collections received from LEAs
- Continued development of a student record system merging the Nebraska Student and Staff Record System (NSSRS) and the Special Education Student Information System (SEIS)

Indicators

B-20: Timely & Accurate Data
C-9: Correction of Noncompliance
C-14: Timely & Accurate Data

B-20: Timely & Accurate Data
C-14: Timely & Accurate Data

Impact Area 4
Improving Accountability and General Supervision

Impact of Improvement Activities on APR Indicator Targets in FFY 2007 for Impact Area 4:
Impact of improvement activities on the monitoring process and correction of noncompliance within one year:

B-15: Correction of Noncompliance

The correction of noncompliance within one year increased from 92.2% to 100%; 92.6% were corrected within one year, and the remaining 7.4% were corrected within 3 months of the one year timeline. Currently, 100% of the noncompliance identified in FFY2006 has been corrected. In addition, the 198 FFY2005 findings in the four school districts that remained uncorrected in the FFY2006 APR were corrected.

C-9: Correction of Noncompliance

The correction of noncompliance within one year was 100% for Part C.

Impact of improvement activities on the dispute resolution process:

B-16: Written Complaints

100% of complaints with reports were resolved within the established timeline or were extended for exceptional circumstances. Four complaints were filed. Two were withdrawn. One complaint was resolved within 60 days and one complaint was resolved within the extended timeline. The extension of the timeline is documented within the complaint file. This meets the established target in this area.

B-17: Due Process Hearings

100% of fully adjudicated due process hearings were fully adjudicated within the 45 day timeline or a timeline which was properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. Three due process cases were filed within the relevant timeframe. Of those three cases two were resolved without a hearing. One case was fully adjudicated within an extended timeline. The extension is documented within the case file. Nebraska has met the target of 100% in this indicator.

B-18: Resolution Sessions

No Resolution Sessions were conducted. Since less than 10 resolution sessions were held, baseline data and targets have not been established. However, Nebraska has fully incorporated the requirements for resolution sessions in Rules 51 (Nebraska's administrative rule for the provision of special education programs), Rule 55 (Nebraska's administrative rule for due process hearing procedures), and the Parent Rights pamphlet. These activities have increased knowledge of the requirements of this process with parents and school districts.

B-19: Mediations

62.5% of mediations resulted in mediated agreements. This is a decrease in performance and does not reach the target of 68%. (Since there were less than 10 mediated agreements, the statistical reliability of this data is questionable and should be used cautiously.) There were eleven requests for mediation within the relevant timeframe. Eight mediation sessions were conducted and of those five resulted in written mediation agreements. In three cases mediations were not held.

C-10: Written Complaints, C-11: Due Process Hearings, C-12: Resolution Sessions, C-13: Mediations

No complaints were filed related to Part C, therefore, no resolution sessions or mediations were necessary during the reporting period.

**Impact Area 4
Improving Accountability and General Supervision**

Impact of improvement activities on the collection of timely and accurate data:

B-20: Timely & Accurate Data

For FFY2006 data reported in a timely and accurate manner was 91%. This increased in FFY2007 to 92.35%. While Nebraska did not meet the target of 100%, there was an increase of 4.35%. Nebraska met all the requirements on the Indicator 20 worksheet for the SPP/APR portion, however, are still encountering some complete data submission issues on the 618 reports as Nebraska continues to build and expand our longitudinal data collection system. Nebraska anticipates that these issues will be resolved in the future (Indicator B20).

C-14: Timely & Accurate Data

Nebraska continued to meet the target of 100% of data reported in a timely and accurate manner for FFY2007. This remains unchanged from FFY2006.

Ongoing and Future Strategies and Improvement Activities for Impact Area 4:

Strategy 1: Data Analysis and System Support

Activity 1.	Refinement of system that draws information from all data sources to identify priority areas for monitoring and training.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-15: Correction of Noncompliance B-16: Written Complaints B-17: Due Process Hearings B-18: Resolution Sessions B-19: Mediations B-20: Timely & Accurate Data C-9: Correction of Noncompliance C-10: Written Complaints
	<i>Status:</i>	New	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	FFY2008-2010	
Activity 2.	Refinement of system that incorporates data on district performance on special education indicators into the general education school improvement process		<i>Indicators:</i> B-20: Timely & Accurate Data C-14: Timely & Accurate Data
	<i>Status:</i>	New	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	FFY2008-2010	
Activity 3.	Refinement of data collection system through continuation of verification procedures for state and district data and completion of all student and staff record system (NSSRS)		<i>Indicators:</i> B-20: Timely & Accurate Data C-14: Timely & Accurate Data
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	FFY2008-2010	

Impact Area 4
Improving Accountability and General Supervision

Strategy 2: Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Activity 1.	Development, dissemination and training in ILCD procedures for identification and timely correction of non-compliance.		<i>Indicators:</i> B-15: Correction of noncompliance C-9: Correction of Noncompliance C-10: Written Complaints C-11: Due Process Hearings C-12: Resolution Sessions C-13: Mediations C-14: Timely & Accurate Data
	<i>Status:</i>	Continuing	
	<i>Timeline:</i>	FFY2008	

Resources for Strategies and Improvement Activities for Impact Area 4:

<i>Resources:</i>	<i>Strategy:</i>	4		
	<i>Activity:</i>	1	2	3
Data Team				X
ILCD Facilitators	X			
ILCD Team	X	X	X	X
Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC)	X	X		X
NDE Approval & Accreditation Team/Early Development Network			X	
OSEP Monitoring Conference	X			
Westat Data Conference				X

Attachment 2:

Parent Survey (indicator 8)

Parent Survey

center perf

NDE 06-083 (Page 1 of 4)
NEW ILCD Survey 07/06

IMPROVING LEARNING FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

LOCAL SELF-ASSESSMENT

Special Education

Nebraska Parent Survey for Pre-School and School-Aged Children With Disabilities

TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS AGES 3 THROUGH 21 YEARS IN

_____ School District, NEBRASKA:

Your help is needed to improve the special education services in our schools. This survey asks for your opinions about the quality of services provided through our school district to your child with special needs. You can help us assess the special education services provided to your child by answering the questions in this survey. Please base your answers on your own personal experiences. All surveys are confidential. You do not need to put your name on this form.

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions on this form and return it within two weeks. If you have questions about this survey, please contact _____ at _____.

Today's Date
(date you completed this survey)

<input type="radio"/> Jan	Day	Year
<input type="radio"/> Feb	2	0
<input type="radio"/> Mar	0	0
<input type="radio"/> Apr	1	1
<input type="radio"/> May	2	2
<input type="radio"/> Jun	3	3
<input type="radio"/> Jul	4	4
<input type="radio"/> Aug	5	5
<input type="radio"/> Sep	6	6
<input type="radio"/> Oct	7	7
<input type="radio"/> Nov	8	8
<input type="radio"/> Dec	9	9

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

SERIAL #

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use black or blue pen or a number 2 pencil.
- Do not use pens with ink that soaks through the paper.
- Make dark marks that fill the bubble completely.
- Make no stray marks.

CORRECT MARK: ●

INCORRECT MARKS: ○ × ○ ○

1. Child's Race/Ethnicity (*Mark only one*)

- White, Not Hispanic
- Black, Not Hispanic
- Hispanic
- American Indian / Alaska Native
- Asian / Pacific Islander

2. What is your child's PRIMARY disability? (*Mark only one*)

- Autism
- Deaf-Blindness
- Developmental Delay
- Behavioral Disorder
- Hearing Impairment
- Specific Learning Disability
- Mental Handicap
- Multiple Impairments
- Orthopedic Impairment
- Other Health Impairment
- Speech/Language Impairment
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Visual Impairment

3. What is the age of your child?

Years
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

4. What is the grade of your child?

- Pre-K
- K
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 12+

Office Use Only

County/District No. _____

Please Continue On Next Page

Parent Survey

NDE 06-083 (Page 2 of 4)
NEW ILCD Survey 07/06

► *The next items ask how strongly you agree or disagree with statements about your experiences with your child's special education. For each item, please mark the answer that best describes your experience or feelings. If the statement does not apply to your situation, please fill in #6, "Does Not Apply."*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I Do Not Know	Does Not Apply
► 5. Before my child was referred for special education services, the teachers and school tried different ways to help my child in the general education classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 6. When my child was first evaluated for special education, the evaluation addressed all concerns raised by me and other team members.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 7. The results of my child's assessments or evaluations were explained to me in ways I understood.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 8. I have received information from my school or school district about my family's rights (such as due process or procedural safeguards) and the services that my child is entitled to receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 9. I have received information about special education for my child in my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 10. I understand my family's legal rights under special education law.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 11. When my child moved from the Early Intervention Program to the Preschool Program, there were no breaks in services and no services were stopped.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 12. As a member of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team, I have a say in decisions about the special education and related services that my child receives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 13. My child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) team offers me real choices.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 14. I feel that members of my child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) team treat me as an equal part of the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 15. Meetings are conducted in our native language, or sign language interpreters are provided.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 16. Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings about my child's education program are held at a place and time convenient for my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
► 17. At Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, we talk about whether my child needs special education services during the summer or other times when school is not in session.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please Continue On Next Page



Parent Survey

NDE 06-083 (Page 3 of 4)
NEW ILCD Survey 07/06

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I Do Not Know	Does Not Apply
➤ 18. My child's teachers know a lot about his/her specific disability and how to work with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 19. The number of students in my child's classes permits teachers and related service providers to meet my child's needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 20. I feel like my child is included in the general education classroom as much as is appropriate for his/her needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 21. My child is not removed from the general education classroom just because of needed accommodations or modifications.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 22. My child's teachers or the school provides all accommodations or modifications included in my child's Individualized Education Program (IEP).	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 23. My child participates in some academic classes (math, reading, etc.) with children who do not have disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 24. My child has opportunities to participate in school activities such as clubs, sports, field trips, and assemblies.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 25. If my child's behavior interferes with his/her learning or the learning of others, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team talks about ways to address my child's behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 26. My child is receiving appropriate special education and related services designed to meet his/her individual needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 27. School personnel respect my family's ethnic and cultural background.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 28. I have all the opportunities I want to be involved in school improvement activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 29. My child's special education program is preparing him/her for life after high school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
➤ 30. By my child's 16th birthday, both my child and I were involved in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting to talk about and plan my child's transition from school to other life and work opportunities after leaving school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please Continue On Next Page

Parent Survey

NDE 06-083 (Page 4 of 4)
NEW ILCD Survey 07/06

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I Do Not Know	Does Not Apply
▶ 31. My family and I are able to determine my child's progress.	1	2	3	4	5	6
▶ 32. My family and I know how to access services and supports.	1	2	3	4	5	6
▶ 33. As a parent, I have been provided the opportunities to improve my skills in supporting my child with special needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
▶ 34. Based on the needs of my child, my family and I are able to effectively participate in typical activities for children and families in the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
▶ 35. Based on the needs of my child, my family and I are provided strategies to develop and maintain social relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Mark Response Form by Pearson #M025166-3 604 321 ECR06 Printed in U.S.A.

SERIAL #

**You Have Completed The Survey.
Thank You Very Much For Your Time And Help!**

Attachment 3:
618Table 6 (indicator 3)

618 table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 1 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0859
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION A. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE MATH ASSESSMENT¹

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: 6/30/2008

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEP ⁽¹⁾	ALL STUDENTS ⁽²⁾
9	3775	23748
4	3796	23492
5	3499	23344
6	3296	23490
7	3132	23746
8	2982	23826
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE)	11	24180

¹At a state as close as possible to the testing date.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 2 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0559
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

618 table 6

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS	
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMMODATIONS (3A)
3	3644	1112
4	3657	1492
5	3234	1463
6	2969	1304
7	2746	1231
8	2612	1184
HIGH SCHOOL:	11	856
	2112	

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: FEBRUARY 01, 2009
Version Date: 12/15/2008

618 table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE-NEBRASKA

PAGE 3 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT			
	TOTAL (A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (A1)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (A2)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (A3)
3	167	-9	-9	167
4	202	-9	-9	202
5	191	-9	-9	191
6	221	-9	-9	221
7	244	-9	-9	244
8	223	-9	-9	223
HIGH SCHOOL:	11	-9	-9	188

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: FEBRUARY 01, 2009
Version Date: 12/16/2008

618 table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 5
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE - NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 4 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION B. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT			
			PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ABSENT (8)	EXEMPT FOR OTHER REASONS* (9)	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLB
3	46	-9	0	18	1	
4	14	-9	0	20	3	
5	44	-9	0	29	1	
5	71	-9	0	32	3	
7	99	-9	0	39	4	
8	91	-9	0	54	2	
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	-9	2	56	0	

*Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and/or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of assessment, students do not fill out the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without these changes. In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason. Please provide the reason(s) for exemption.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
NATIONAL CENTER FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 8
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT
2007-2008
PAGE 5 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXP. DATE: 09/31/2009
STATE: NE, NEBRASKA

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)										10A ROW TOTAL	
		Beginning Achievement Level	Progressing Achievement Level	Proficient Achievement Level	Advanced Achievement Level	Not Assessed							
3	STARS Mathematics	1111	460	1787	1186	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	3544
4	STARS Mathematics	96	409	1757	1295	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	3557
5	STARS Mathematics	205	595	1535	835	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	3234
6	STARS Mathematics	209	552	1537	671	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2959
7	STARS Mathematics	157	591	1554	457	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2745
8	STARS Mathematics	149	501	1557	405	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2612
9	STARS Mathematics	134	587	1151	240	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2112

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficient
The total number of students reported by achievement in 10A is to equal the number reported in column 3.

618 table 6

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: February 21, 2009
Version Date: 12/15/2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT
2007-2008

PAGE 6 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPRES. 08/31/2009
STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (108)										108 ROW TOTAL	
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level		
3		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
4		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
5		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
6		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
7		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
8		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9
HIGH SCHOOL: 11		-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROICIENT:
The total number of students reported by achievement level in 108 is equal the number reported in column 4A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT
2007-2008

PAGE 7 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0669
FORM EPR/RS: 08/10/09
STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (100)										100 ROW TOTAL	Number of students included within the NCLB 2% CAP ^{1,2}			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10					
3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HIGH SCHOOL: 11		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: 1

The total number of students reported by achievement level in 100 is to equal the number reported in column 16.
 Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within the NCLB 2% cap.
 *Use 2% adjusted cap, in accordance with NCLB provisions, if applicable. See page 8 of attached instructions.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: February 11, 2008
Version Date: 12/15/2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT
2007-2008

PAGE 8 OF 11
CASE NO. 1820-0551
FORM EXPRES. 09/31/2005
STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (100)										100 ROW TOTAL*	Number of Students Included With 7% NCLB % COP	
		Beginning Achievement Level	Progressing Achievement Level	Proficient Achievement Level	Advanced Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level			
3	STARS Alternate Math	17	20	44	85	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	187	1
4	STARS Alternate Math	28	34	48	91	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	202	1
5	STARS Alternate Math	28	48	62	55	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	191	1
5	STARS Alternate Math	34	42	108	38	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	221	1
7	STARS Alternate Math	39	49	101	59	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	244	1
8	STARS Alternate Math	36	36	98	52	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	223	1
HIGH SCHOOL: 11	STARS Alternate Math	26	40	71	51	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	188	1

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficient

*Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within NCLB 1% COP.

*The total number of students reported by achievement level in 100 is to equal the number reported in column 4c.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 9 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION C. SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON MATH ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 5) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 5) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 7) ¹	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 8) ¹	NO VALID SCORES ² (11)	TOTAL ³ (12)
3	3544	-9	-9	-9	187	3776
4	3557	-9	-9	-9	202	3736
5	3234	-9	-9	-9	191	3435
6	2959	-9	-9	-9	221	3230
7	2748	-9	-9	-9	244	3132
8	2612	-9	-9	-9	223	2982
HIGH SCHOOL:	2112	-9	-9	-9	188	2514

¹STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SUBMITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

²Column 11 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

³Column 12 should equal the number of students with IEPs reported in column 1 of Section A, if the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 12 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in column 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: FEBRUARY 01, 2009
VERSION DATE: 12/15/2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 10 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009

DATE OF ENROLLMENT COUNT: _____

SECTION D. ENROLLMENT DATA FOR THE READING ASSESSMENT*

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH IEPs (1)	ALL STUDENTS (2)
3	3772	23748
4	3795	23452
5	3493	23344
6	3302	23450
7	3142	23748
8	2991	23828
HIGH SCHOOL (SPECIFY GRADE)	11	2590

*In a case as close as possible to the testing date.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: FEBRUARY 01, 2009
Version Date: 12/15/2008

618 table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 5
PART OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STA
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

PAGE 11 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPRES. 08/31/2009

2007-2008

NE - NEBRASKA

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON REGIONAL ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK REGULAR ASSESSMENT ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS		
	TOTAL (3)	SUBSET (OF 3) WHO TOOK THE ASSESSMENT WITH ACCOMMODATIONS (2A)	LEP STUDENTS IN US < 12 MONTHS WHOSE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST TEST REPLACED REGULAR REGIONAL ASSESSMENT (2B)
3	3535	1035	-5
4	3558	1451	-5
5	3235	1542	-5
6	2882	1282	-5
7	2752	1234	-5
8	2687	1132	-5
HIGH SCHOOL:	2317	1005	-5

Report those LEP students who, at the time of the reading assessment, were in the United States for less than 10 months and took the English Language Proficiency (ELP) test in place of the regular reading assessment.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: FEBRUARY 01, 2009
VERSION DATE: JANUARY 2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 12 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0559
FORM EXPRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES WHO TOOK ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT			
	TOTAL (A)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (A1)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (A2)	SUBSET (OF 4) WHOSE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT WAS BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (A3)
3	164	-3	-3	164
4	199	-3	-3	199
5	192	-3	-3	192
6	218	-3	-3	218
7	242	-3	-3	242
8	221	-3	-3	221
HIGH SCHOOL:	183	-3	-3	183

618 table 6

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: FEBRUARY 01, 2009
VERSION DATE: 12/15/2008

618 table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

SECTION E. PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS COUNTED AS NONPARTICIPANTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NCLEB		STUDENTS WHO DID NOT TAKE ANY ASSESSMENT		
	STUDENTS WHOSE ASSESSMENT RESULTS WERE INVALID (5)	STUDENTS WHO TOOK AN OUT OF LEVEL TEST (6)	PARENTAL EXEMPTION (7)	ASSENT (8)	DID NOT TAKE FOR OTHER REASONS (9)
3	50	-9	0	21	2
4	18	-9	0	22	2
5	42	-9	0	23	1
6	74	-9	0	25	3
7	78	-9	0	30	0
8	47	-9	0	35	1
HIGH SCHOOL :	11	-9	2	41	0

*Invalid results are assessment results that cannot be used for reporting and/or aggregation due to problem in the testing process (e.g. students do not take all portions of assessment, students do not fit the answer sheet correctly) or changes in testing materials that resulted in a score that is not deemed by the State to be comparable to scores received by students who took the assessment without the *In a separate listing, report the number of students who did not take an assessment for other reasons by grade and specific reason.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: February 01, 2009
Version Date: 12/16/2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT
2007-2008

PAGE 14 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPRES: 08/31/2009
STATE: NE, NEBRASKA

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	REGULAR ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10A)										10A ROW TOTAL
		Beginning Achievement Level	Progressing Achievement Level	Proficient Achievement Level	Advanced Achievement Level	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	
3	STARS Reading	151	653	1545	1186	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	3535
4	STARS Reading	168	630	1712	1148	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	3558
5	STARS Reading	225	672	1574	864	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	3235
6	STARS Reading	193	683	1518	698	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2982
7	STARS Reading	151	645	1459	537	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2752
8	STARS Reading	95	418	1737	435	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2667
HIGH SCHOOL: 11	STARS Reading	108	494	1474	240	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	-9	2317

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT: Proficient
The total number of students reported by achievement in 10A is to equal the number reported in column 3.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: 08/07/01/2009
VERSION DATE: 12/15/2008

618 table 6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE-NEBRASKA

PAGE 15 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0659
FORM EXPRES. 09/31/2009

SECTION F: PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (10B)										10B ROW TOTAL
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	
3		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
4		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
5		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
6		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
7		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
8		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
9		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
10		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
HIGH SCHOOL: 11		-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROICIENT:

The total number of students reported by achievement level in 10B is equal the number reported in column 4A.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: 2/20/09 01:20:09
VERSION DATE: 12/15/2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT
2007-2008
PAGE 16 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0583
FORM EXPRES. 09/31/2009
STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON MODIFIED ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (005)										100% SBI/ TOTAL ¹	Number of students included (N=100%)
		Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level	Achievement Level		
3		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HIGH SCHOOL: 11		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:

¹The total number of students reported by achievement level in 100 is to equal the number reported in column 4B.
²Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they fell within the NCLB 2% cap.
³Use 2% adjusted cap, in accordance with NCLB provisions, if applicable. See page 8 of attached instructions.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE - NEBRASKA

PAGE 17 OF 18
OMB NO. 1820-0689
FORM EXPRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION F. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TEST NAME	ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT BASED ON ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS (100)										100 ROW TOTAL	Number of Students Included Within the NCLB 1% CAP	
		Beginning Achievement Level	Progressing Achievement Level	Proficient Achievement Level	Advanced Achievement Level	-	-	-	-	-	-			-
3	STARIS Alternate Reading	11	23	66	64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	154	1
4	STARIS Alternate Reading	23	38	66	72	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	199	1
5	STARIS Alternate Reading	12	33	82	63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	192	1
5	STARIS Alternate Reading	38	29	109	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	218	1
7	STARIS Alternate Reading	33	37	117	56	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	242	1
8	STARIS Alternate Reading	23	32	102	66	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	221	1
HIGH SCHOOL - 11	STARIS Alternate Reading	23	39	70	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	183	1

LOWEST ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL CONSIDERED PROFICIENT:
Proficient
Include all students whose assessment counted as proficient because they're within NCLB 1% cap.
The total number of students reported by achievement level in 100 is to equal the number reported in column 14.

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
CURRENT DATE: 5/20/2008
Version Date: 12/15/2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 6
REPORT OF THE PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON STATE
ASSESSMENTS BY CONTENT AREA, GRADE, AND TYPE OF ASSESSMENT

2007-2008

STATE: NE-NEBRASKA

PAGE 18 OF 18
CMB NO. 1820-0689
FORM EXPRES: 08/31/2009

SECTION F. SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ON READING ASSESSMENT (CONTINUED)

GRADE LEVEL	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10A (FROM PAGE 14)	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10B (FROM PAGE 15)	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10C (FROM PAGE 16)	TOTAL REPORTED FOR COLUMN 10D (FROM PAGE 17)	NO VALID SCORE ¹ (11)	TOTAL ² (12)
3	3535	-9	-9	-9	164	3772
4	3558	-9	-9	-9	199	3759
5	3235	-9	-9	-9	192	3433
6	2982	-9	-9	-9	218	3302
7	2752	-9	-9	-9	242	3142
8	2687	-9	-9	-9	221	2951
HIGH SCHOOL:	2317	-9	-9	-9	183	2580

¹STATES SHOULD NOT REPORT DATA ON THIS PAGE. THESE DATA WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE REPORTED DATA AFTER THE COUNTS ARE SPLITTED. PLEASE REVIEW FOR ERRORS.

²Column 11 is calculated by summing the numbers reported in column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

³Column 12 should equal the number of students with EPAs reported in column 1 of Section A. If the number of students is not the same, provide an explanation. Column 12 should always equal the sum of the number of students reported in column 3 plus column 4 plus column 5 plus column 6 plus column 7 plus column 8 plus column 9.

Attachment 4:
618 Table 7 (indicators 16-19)

618 Table 7

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

TABLE 7
REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT
2007-08

PAGE 1 OF 1
OMB NO.: 1820-0677
FORM EXPIRES: 08/31/2009
NE - NEBRASKA

STATE:

SECTION A: WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	4
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	2
(a) Reports with findings	2
(b) Reports within timeline	1
(c) Reports within extended timelines	1
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	2
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Mediation requests total	11
(2.1) Mediations held	8
(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	8
(i) Mediation agreements	5
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	3

SECTION C: DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS	
(3) Due process complaints total	3
(3.1) Resolution meetings	0
(a) Written Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	1
(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	1
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	2

SECTION D: EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS (RELATED TO DISCIPLINARY DECISION)	
(4) Expedited due process complaints total	0
(4.1) Resolution meetings	0
(a) Written settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

CURRENT DATE:
Version Date: 9/12/2008