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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The FFY 2020 state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR) for the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (Alaska DEED) reports on data from the 2020-2021 school year and reporting period. It demonstrates how Alaska DEED and its special education stakeholders are invested in ensuring that Alaska DEED continues to ensure that LEAs provide a free and appropriate public education to Alaska's children with disabilities that results in improved student outcomes and that Alaska DEED meets the requirements of IDEA including reporting timely and accurate data in the SPP/APR.

The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This SPP/APR demonstrates progress for Alaska school districts and students in many areas, describes how the state is maintaining high levels of compliance, and addresses areas where it did not improve, including the impacts of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, where applicable. Through this SPP/APR, Alaska DEED is also establishing targets for the next five years for multiple indicators including revised Indicators 1, 2, and 3.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

Alaska DEED collects the data for the SPP/APR from its state data systems and from districts as the data are available throughout and at the close of the reporting period. Alaska DEED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts and work closely with districts to ensure that data are complete and accurate. Alaska DEED reviews the data to inform its work throughout the year and shares the data with stakeholders to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, Alaska DEED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and to inform various stakeholder meetings throughout the year.

Alaska DEED is committed to improving results for students with an IEP and maintaining compliance with IDEA and uses the SPP/APR to assess its progress in meeting those goals. Many stakeholders contribute to the annual development of the SPP/APR, development and review of targets and strategies, and ongoing review of data and priority setting. These include: The Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education (GCDSE) which serves as the State's Special Education Advisory Panel; Stone Soup Group and LINKS (Alaska's parent training and information and community parent resource centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); institutes of higher education; and Alaska school district administrators and staff.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

54

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Alaska DEED has a multi-faceted general supervision system in place to ensure IDEA Part B requirements are met that includes: policies and procedures for special education administration in Alaska, administration of Part B and Alaska funds through the grants management system, compliance monitoring, dispute resolution (including mediation, complaints, and due process), and technical assistance provided by Alaska EED directly and through multiple contracts, and ongoing coordination with other Alaska EED divisions. Alaska EED incorporates its technical assistance and professional development systems into its general supervision system to proactively promote compliance. Needs identified through the general supervision system are addressed through technical assistance and professional development.

Special Education Policies and Procedures
The Guidance for Special Education Personnel handbook contains the procedures for special education, based on state regulation (policy) that closely mirrors IDEA. Changes to policy require significant work with governing boards, but Alaska DEED has authority to revise the guidance and procedures document when necessary. Alaska DEED uses this to provide guidance to LEAs, respond to questions, and ensure compliance with IDEA proactively.

Administration of Part B and Alaska funds through the Grants Management System
Alaska DEED's grants management system allows special education program managers to use the grants management system to gather additional information on district use of funds and to ensure that districts meet required timelines for fiscal reporting. Through the grants management system, Alaska DEED collects data and and assurances from each LEA. Alaska DEED can also leverage its grant management system to require additional reporting or identify high-risk grantees as needed for general supervision.

Compliance Monitoring: Identification and Correction of Noncompliance
Each district in Alaska is monitored annually through the supplemental workbook data collection that Alaska DEED uses to collect data to determine LEA compliance with regulatory requirements of IDEA, including with the SPP/APR indicators. In addition, Alaska DEED conducts cyclical onsite compliance monitoring in 10-15 districts annually to review compliance and provide technical assistance. Large districts typically receive onsite monitoring visits each year. Additional monitoring occurs whenever a need is identified. Through these mechanisms, Alaska monitors compliance with not only the SPP/APR indicators, but other related IDEA requirements and Alaska state requirements. For the 2020-2021 school year, some monitoring was conducted virtually due to COVID-19, but Alaska DEED has now resumed some onsite monitoring activities.

Identification and Correction of Noncompliance
Alaska DEED notifies districts of findings of noncompliance within three months of its discovery of potential noncompliance. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, written notification of findings of noncompliance includes the specific regulatory citation with which noncompliance has been found, evidence for the finding of noncompliance (quantitative and/or qualitative), and one-year timeline for correction and verification of correction.

Alaska EED works closely with all 54 districts to ensure timely correction of all noncompliance. Alaska EED verifies, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, that findings are corrected within one year. Prior to verifying correction of noncompliance, Alaska EED reviews data to verify: that each LEA is correctly implementing the specific IDEA or Alaska requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or data collections; and that every individual case of noncompliance is corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. For timeline-specific requirements, Alaska EED verifies that each required action, although late, occurred.

If noncompliance were not verified as corrected within one year of identification or if districts do not comply with corrective actions, Alaska DEED could impose additional corrective actions including sanctions and enforcement actions such as additional reporting requirements, directed use of funds for professional development, communication with district superintendents, and additional onsite monitoring.

Mechanisms for Monitoring Improvement
In addition to compliance monitoring, Alaska DEED has several mechanisms to look at performance and improvement on performance indicators. Alaska has always considered performance indicators in its annual determinations of whether school districts meet the requirements of IDEA. Performance on student-level outcomes is also considered during data-based decision making at Alaska DEED related to monitoring cycles, technical assistance and professional development.

Dispute Resolution System
Mediation - Alaska DEED provides mediation services to parents of students with disabilities and/or school districts in Alaska free of charge. Mediations are scheduled in a timely manner and must be held in a location that is convenient to the parties to the dispute. If the parties resolve a dispute through the mediation process, the parties execute a written, signed mediation agreement.

Complaint Investigation - Within 60 days after a complaint is received by Alaska DEED, the investigation is completed and a report issued to the complainant and the school district or agency. The investigative report addresses each allegation in the complaint and includes: a Summary of the Complaint, a Summary of the Investigation, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and any Corrective Action that is required. The state keeps a log in the complaints database of the corrective actions, and records the date as the district completes each action. A complaint may be filed by an organization or person and must be in writing.

Due Process - Any party may initiate a hearing. The District shall provide the parent a copy of the Procedural Safeguards upon receipt of a request for due process, and inform the parent of the availability of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism. However, the offer of mediation does not negate the parent’s or district’s right to a due process hearing. Alaska DEED ensures, through contractors, that timelines are met for due process hearings and their resolution.

In addition to the required annual reporting, Alaska DEED provides other data reports to districts in order to assist them in improving results and ensuring compliance for students with disabilities. One example of this is Alaska's DEED annual disproportionality report that provides each district with it disproportionality data, including districts that have not been identified has having significant disproportionality. This allows districts to proactively address any potential problems prior to the state requiring corrective action.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

Alaska DEED's technical assistance system is tied very closely to the other components of its general supervision system. Alaska relies heavily on contracted partners including the Alaska Special Education Service Agency (SESA), Alaska's Educational Resource Center (SERRC), and Alaska's parent training and information center, Stone Soup Group, to supplement Alaska DEED's and provide additional technical assistance to LEAs.

Alaska provides technical assistance in areas of need identified by Alaska DEED and in areas identified and requested by LEAs. Alaska EED identifies areas of need based on monitoring results and data reported to Alaska DEED as well as issues that rise up through the dispute resolution procedures.

Alaska DEED provides multiple levels of technical assistance to LEAs. General TA is provided to all districts through webinars, conferences, trainings, the Alaska DEED website and written memos. More targeted district-specific TA is generally provided though telephone calls and onsite visits. An example of effective general TA that EED provides are its online eLearning modules. These modules cover topics such as special education evaluation, IEP development, paraeducator best practices and secondary transition. Alaska DEED provides intensive TA through review of district specific data, guided self-assessment, reviews of policy, procedure and practices and instruction on evidence based practices to address areas of need.

Int the past, Alaska has received intensive TA and has been assisted in providing intensive district TA on secondary transition and outcomes for high school students from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: the Collaborative. One of the greatest outcomes of the work together, as reported in the SSIP, has been the collaboration between vocational rehabilitation, tribal vocational rehabilitation, and other partners on the Alaska Interagency Transition Council. This group of partners has continued to provide interagency trainings throughout Alaska, after the intensive technical assistance Alaska DEED received ended.

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

Alaska DEED ensures that its LEA special education directors are provided the most up-to-date information through an annual directors' training, annual new directors' training, and ongoing communication via email, telephone, and webinars. These annual trainings, supported with ongoing distance training, cover topics relating to state policy and procedure updates, special education law and instructional best practice. In addition, Alaska EED participates in the Alaska Statewide Special Education Conference (ASSEC) where information relating to Alaska DEED's annual performance on its SPP/APR are disseminated and policies and procedures are reviewed with the special education classroom teacher audience. The ASSEC is being held in person again in 2022 after being virtual in 2021. Finally, Alaska DEED contributes to special educator preparation at the university level by presenting on special education policy, practice, and performance on SPP/APR indicators.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

15

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The parent members of the Governor's Council have always been active participants and engaged with Alaska DEED in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress for the SPP/APR. For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP with the intention of allowing more parents to provide their input on the SPP/APR. Alaska will continue to use these mechanisms and, based on responses from families and parents, will continue to use multiple mechanisms and will strive to break up the data to get feedback on smaller amounts of data and fewer topics at one time.

Note that due to the multiple mechanisms of participation and Alaska EED's desire to allow for anonymous feedback through its survey and other mechanisms, the number of parents reported may not be an unduplicated count.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

Alaska DEED works very closely with its PTI, Stone Soup Group, to build parent capacity and is specifically focusing now on increasing the capacity of diverse groups of parents to engage in providing input on items such as the SPP/APR and to support the state's improvement activities. One area where this has been successful is through targeted engagement around transition through Alaska's SSIP. Alaska DEED has found that the focus on one area that may impact other improved outcomes (e.g., focusing on transition which impacts graduation and drop-out rates) is helpful for families rather than overwhelming them with all of the available data. Alaska DEED will continue to work with Stone Soup Group to build the capacity of diverse groups of parents.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Alaska DEED has always worked closely with the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education (GCDSE) which serves as the State Advisory Panel to solicit public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. However, for the FFY 12020 SPP/APR, Alaska DEED expanded its solicitation to include additional public input through a survey and a series of public input webinars held in January 2022. The use of an online survey and public input webinars, held at different times of day, allowed for broader participation of many stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council including parents, district and school staff, and others.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

Alaska DEED makes a link to the complete SPP and APR available on its website each year at https://education.alaska.gov/TLS/SPED/. The SPP/APR will be posted on that website as soon it is approved by OSEP and posted to the OSEP website. Alaska DEED links directly to the OSEP website to ensure that stakeholders have access not only to the reports submitted by Alaska DEED but also to OSEP's responses to the APRs. The website will be updated to include the final copies of the improvement strategies and evaluation plan for the SSIP as well upon OSEP approval of those documents.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

The State of Alaska reports to the public on its SPP/APR results and on the performance of each LEA in Alaska on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the submission of its APR to OSEP. A copy of each district’s Special Education District Data Profile (including each district’s performance on the applicable APR indicators against Alaska’s targets) can be found on the Alaska DEED website at http://education.alaska.gov/rcsped/. Special Education District Data Profiles are currently available for FFY19 data (2019-20 school year) and prior years.

Alaska DEED also makes a link to the complete SPP and APR available on its website each year at https://education.alaska.gov/TLS/SPED/. The SPP/APR will be posted on that website when it is approved by OSEP. Alaska DEED links directly to the OSEP website to ensure that stakeholders have access not only to the reports submitted by Alaska DEED but also to OSEP's responses to the APRs.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Alaska accessed technical assistance from: OSEP, by participating in OSEP's monthly technical assistance calls and receiving individualized technical assistance from multiple OSEP state leads and experts; the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) ; the National Center on Systemic Improvement (NCSI); and the IDEA Data Center (IDC) by receiving individualized TA and participating in cross-state webinars. In addition, Alaska accessed technical assistance through interacting with colleagues through the National Association fo State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) and through increasing staff knowledge through its LRP subscriptions.

Due to COVID travel restrictions, events were held online or, when held in person, Alaska DEED staff were not able to travel to conferences or other events during FFY 2020.

Alaska DEED took many actions as a result of the technical assistance it received to improve its system and its performance on the SPP/APR indicators. Alaska continued refining its data collection instructions and processes including developing new ways to analyze submitted data consistently and reduce any potential errors. Alaska's new data manager participated regularly in the IDC listserv and adjusted new data collections based on lessons learned from colleagues across the country. Alaska continued to focus on indicators related to graduation, dropout, and secondary transition that lead to improved post-secondary outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14), and continued to develop interagency relationships related to secondary transition and continued communication mechanisms. As a result of TA received from OSEP and NCSI, Alaska also revised its SIMR to target a new subgroup of students and reflect the current work on culturally-responsive practice.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 70.71% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 57.02% | 53.87% | 58.73% | 56.94% | 60%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 70.71% | 70.00% | 70.00% | 71.00% | 72.00% | 73.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholders agreed to reset baseline data for this indicator given the change in measurement and agreed to the proposed targets.

Alaska stakeholders supported a flat target for the next two years followed by an increase in these data and appreciated the opportunity to set meaningful targets and not simply repeat the targets from the ESSA plan. One parent expressed concerns about the SPP/APR's focus on increasing graduation rates rather than increasing access to employment or independent living skills training as those items are not always congruent in IEP meeting discussions.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 799 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 61 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 4 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 266 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 799 | 1,130 | 60%[[3]](#footnote-4) | 70.71% | 70.71% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The graduation requirements in Alaska are the same for children with and without IEPs. General graduation requirements are established in Alaska regulation at 4 AAC 06.075 and each school district defines its graduation requirements within this regulation.

4 AAC 06.075. High school graduation requirements.
(a) Each chief school administrator shall develop and submit to the district board for approval a plan consisting of district high school graduation requirements. The plan must require that, before graduation, a student must have earned at least 21 units of credit.
(b) Specific subject area units of credit requirements must be set out in each district plan and must require that, before graduation, a student must have completed at least the following: (1) language arts - four units of credit; (2) social studies - three units of credit; (3) mathematics - two units of credit for students graduating from high school on or before June 30 2017, and three units of credit for students graduating from high school on or after July 1, 2017; (4) science - two units of credit; and (5) health/physical education - one unit of credit.
(c) Transfer students who have earned 13 units of credit while in attendance outside the district may, at the discretion of the district, be excused from the district subject area units of credit requirements.
(d) Beginning January 1, 2009, the three units of credit in social studies required under (b)(2) of this section must include one-half unit of credit in Alaska history or demonstration that the student meets the Alaska history performance standards. The provisions of this subsection do not apply to a student who: (1) transfers into an Alaska public school after the student's second year of high school; or (2) has already successfully completed a high school state history course from another state.
(e) In this section, "unit of credit" means the credit that a student is awarded for achieving a passing grade in a course of study by meeting the content standards for a course of study as prescribed by a local school board.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 23.54% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 5.50% | 5.20% | 5.00% | 5.20% | 5.00% |
| Data | 5.36% | 6.10% | 5.23% | 5.16% | 4.90% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 23.54% | 23.50% | 23.50% | 23.00% | 22.00% | 21.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholders agreed to reset baseline data for this indicator given the change in measurement and agreed to the proposed targets. Stakeholders indicated that training will be needed on why this indicator has changed and how it is measured differently from the dropout rates that are used in other data collections.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 799 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 61 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 4 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 266 |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 266 | 1,130 | 4.90% | 23.54% | 23.54% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

A dropout (discontinuing school) is defined as a student who was enrolled in the district at some time during the school year and whose enrollment terminated. Dropouts do not include graduates, transfers to public or private schools, or transfers to state- or district-approved education programs. Students with absences due to suspension, illness, or medical conditions are not reported as dropouts. Students who leave the school to seek a GED are considered dropouts.

A student who transfers to a non-district sponsored home school environment is a dropout unless he/she enrolls in a correspondence program that terminates in a diploma. (When district dropout totals are calculated, Alaska EED verifies whether dropouts have enrolled in another district. If student has enrolled elsewhere, that student is not counted in the numerator of the dropout rate). A student who transfers to a private school that terminates in a diploma is not considered a dropout; however, a student who discontinues public school and enrolls in a credit recovery program is to be reported as a dropout.

A student who leaves school with a certificate of attendance in lieu of a high school diploma, returns to school within the same reporting year, and then drops out in the same reporting year will be counted as a dropout for the year.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 73.07% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 63.81% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 61.37% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 72.95% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 63.31% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 60.37% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 73.07% | 75.00%  | 78.00% | 83.00% | 88.00% | 93.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 63.81% | 65.00% | 68.00% | 73.00% | 78.00% | 83.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 61.37% | 63.00% | 66.00% | 71.00% | 76.00% | 81.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 72.95% | 75.00% | 78.00% | 83.00% | 88.00% | 93.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 63.31% | 65.00% | 68.00% | 73.00% | 78.00% | 83.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 60.37% | 63.00% | 66.00% | 71.00% | 76.00% | 81.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholders agreed to reset baseline data for this indicator given the change in measurement (Alaska DEED previously reported for all grades together and not separately by grade) and the gap between assessment years. Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including a slower rise initially due to upcoming assessment changes including a change in the statewide assessment. Stakeholders requested revisiting the baseline data and proposed targets following the implementation of the new assessment and when data are available for review.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 1,582 | 1,379 | 1,302 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 300 | 151 | 145 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 822 | 676 | 593 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 34 | 53 | 61 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 1,582 | 1,379 | 1,302 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 301 | 144 | 139 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 819 | 676 | 586 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 34 | 53 | 61 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,156 | 1,582 |  | 73.07% | 73.07% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 880 | 1,379 |  | 63.81% | 63.81% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 799 | 1,302 |  | 61.37% | 61.37% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,154 | 1,582 |  | 72.95% | 72.95% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 873 | 1,379 |  | 63.31% | 63.31% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 786 | 1,302 |  | 60.37% | 60.37% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

All State Assessment information and data, including public reports of assessment results, can be found at: https://education.alaska.gov/assessments/results

To find public reporting with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f):
\* Select a year
\* For the regular statewide assessment: - Under PEAKS, select Statewide, Districtwide or Schoolwide results - Select a District or School, if needed - For each assessment, click on the "groups" link in the far right column. This will produce a report that breaks out assessment data by specific group and includes the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels.
\* For the alternate assessment: - Under Alternate Assessment, select Statewide, Districtwide, or Schoolwide results - Those reports include the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 are below the required 95% participation rate.

## 3A - Required Actions

The State did not provide targets, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 12.30% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 9.55% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 10.03% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 13.13% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 5.00% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 6.07% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 12.30% | 12.30% | 12.90% | 13.40% | 13.90% | 14.40% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 9.55% | 9.60% | 10.10% | 10.60% | 11.10% | 11.60% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 10.03% | 10.00% | 10.50% | 11.00% | 11.50% | 12.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 13.13% | 13.10% | 14.10% | 15.10% | 16.10% | 17.10% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.50% | 6.00% | 6.50% | 7.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 6.07% | 6.07% | 6.60% | 7.10% | 7.60% | 8.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholders agreed to reset baseline data for this indicator given the change in measurement (Alaska DEED previously reported for all grades together and not separately by grade) and the gap between assessment years. Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including a slower rise initially due to upcoming assessment changes including a change in the statewide assessment. Stakeholders requested revisiting the baseline data and proposed targets following the implementation of the new assessment and when data are available for review.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,122 | 827 | 738 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 83 | 22 | 24 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 55 | 57 | 50 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,120 | 820 | 725 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 76 | 13 | 13 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 71 | 28 | 31 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 138 | 1,122 |  | 12.30% | 12.30% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 79 | 827 |  | 9.55% | 9.55% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 74 | 738 |  | 10.03% | 10.03% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 147 | 1,120 |  | 13.13% | 13.13% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 41 | 820 |  | 5.00% | 5.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 44 | 725 |  | 6.07% | 6.07% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

All State Assessment information and data, including public reports of assessment results, can be found at: https://education.alaska.gov/assessments/results.

To find public reporting with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f):
\* Select a year
\* For the regular statewide assessment: - Under PEAKS, select Statewide, Districtwide or Schoolwide results - Select a District or School, if needed - For each assessment, click on the "groups" link in the far right column. This will produce a report that breaks out assessment data by specific group and includes the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels.
\* For the alternate assessment: - Under Alternate Assessment, select Statewide, Districtwide, or Schoolwide results - Those reports include the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | \*[[4]](#footnote-5)1 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 16.98% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 18.03% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 14.71% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | \*[[5]](#footnote-6)1 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 24.59% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | \*[[6]](#footnote-7)1 | 2.94% | 2.90% | 2.90% | 3.90% | 4.90% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 16.98% | 16.98% | 17.00% | 17.00% | 18.00% | 19.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 18.03% | 18.03% | 18.00% | 18.00% | 19.00% | 19.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 14.71% | 14.71% | 14.70% | 14.70% | 15.70% | 16.70% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[7]](#footnote-8)1 | 5.66% | 5.70% | 5.70% | 6.70% | 7.70% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 24.59% | 24.59% | 24.60% | 24.60% | 25.60% | 25.60% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholders established baseline data for this new indicator. Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including a slower rise initially due to it being a new indicator and to upcoming assessment changes including a change in the statewide assessment.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 34 | 53 | 61 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | \*[[8]](#footnote-9)1 | 9 | 11 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 34 | 53 | 61 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 5 | \*[[9]](#footnote-10)1 | 15 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | \*[[10]](#footnote-11)1 | 34 |  | \*[[11]](#footnote-12)1 | \*[[12]](#footnote-13)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9 | 53 |  | 16.98% | 16.98% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 11 | 61 |  | 18.03% | 18.03% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 5 | 34 |  | 14.71% | 14.71% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[13]](#footnote-14)1 | 53 |  | \*[[14]](#footnote-15)1 | \*[[15]](#footnote-16)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 15 | 61 |  | 24.59% | 24.59% | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

All State Assessment information and data, including public reports of assessment results, can be found at: https://education.alaska.gov/assessments/results.

To find public reporting with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f):
\* Select a year
\* For the regular statewide assessment: - Under PEAKS, select Statewide, Districtwide or Schoolwide results - Select a District or School, if needed - For each assessment, click on the "groups" link in the far right column. This will produce a report that breaks out assessment data by specific group and includes the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels.
\* For the alternate assessment: - Under Alternate Assessment, select Statewide, Districtwide, or Schoolwide results - Those reports include the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 24.82 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 29.47 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 26.20 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 23.46 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 21.02 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 24.63 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 24.82 | 24.82  | 24.80 | 24.80 | 23.80 | 22.80 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 29.47 | 29.47 | 29.50 | 29.50 | 28.50 | 27.50 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 26.20 | 26.20 | 26.20 | 26.20 | 25.20 | 24.20 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 23.46 | 23.46 | 23.50 | 23.50 | 22.50 | 21.50 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 21.02 | 21.02 | 21.00 | 21.00 | 20.00 | 19.00 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 24.63 | 24.63 | 24.60 | 24.60 | 23.60 | 22.60 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholders established baseline data for this new indicator. Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including a slower rise initially due to it being a new indicator and to upcoming assessment changes including a change in the statewide assessment. Stakeholders requested revisiting the baseline data and proposed targets following the implementation of the new assessment and when data are available for review.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 6,795 | 5,769 | 5,411 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,122 | 827 | 738 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,398 | 2,137 | 1,863 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 124 | 114 | 97 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 83 | 22 | 24 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 55 | 57 | 50 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 6,729 | 5,704 | 5,264 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,120 | 820 | 725 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,286 | 1,415 | 1,556 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 176 | 69 | 60 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 76 | 13 | 13 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 71 | 28 | 31 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 12.30% | 37.12% |  | 24.82 | 24.82 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9.55% | 39.02% |  | 29.47 | 29.47 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 10.03% | 36.22% |  | 26.20 | 26.20 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 13.13% | 36.59% |  | 23.46 | 23.46 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 5.00% | 26.02% |  | 21.02 | 21.02 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 6.07% | 30.70% |  | 24.63 | 24.63 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 5.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 3.80% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.00% | 3.00% |
| Data | 8.00% | 0.00% | 7.84% | 10.00% | 5.66% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 14.29% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 2.80% | 2.80% | 2.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including maintaining rigorous targets based on data prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, knowing that suspension and expulsion rates will again rise as students are back in school, resulting in more districts being included in this indicator. Some stakeholders expressed concern that we may see a rise in student behaviors as students come back to school and others reinforced the importance of appropriate supports in schools to ensure students are getting appropriate interventions and services based on the behaviors that lead to disciplinary actions.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

47

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 7 | 5.66% | 14.29% | 14.29% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

In Alaska, significant discrepancy is defined as a district's rate being 1% or more above the current year's state average rate when looking at the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

For Indicator 4, Alaska established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 students with IEPs enrolled in in the school district and a minimum "n" size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for 10 or more days.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During the 2019-2020 school year, many Alaska schools met virtually or in a hybrid format that included virtual learning. The number of suspensions and expulsions decreased significantly, for all students including students with an IEP. This resulted in very few districts meeting Alaska DEED's established minimum "n" size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. Alaska DEED will continue to review these data to examine ongoing impacts of school closures due to the COVID-10 pandemic, including with its stakeholders, and if needed will revise its methodology.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

For the district identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the examination of 2019-2020 data, Alaska DEED reviewed the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted both as a part of the cyclical monitoring in FFY 2020. The monitoring included reviewing policies, procedures and practices related to IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Alaska DEED staff reviewed files for all students with IEPs that were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. If noncompliance has been identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, Alaska EED would have required the district to revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Alaska DEED verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Alaska DEED's review did not identify noncompliance with the specific requirements related to this indicator as a result of the review in the identified district. The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

 A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 5.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 1.96% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 0 | 7 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

In Alaska, significant discrepancy is defined as a district's rate being 1% or more above the current year's state average rate when looking at the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

For Indicator 4, Alaska established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 students with IEPs enrolled in in the school district and a minimum "n" size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. 7 districts met the minimum "n" size in the 2019-2020 school year.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During the 2019-2020 school year, many Alaska schools met virtually or in a hybrid format that included virtual learning. The number of suspensions and expulsions decreased significantly, for all students including students with an IEP. This resulted in very few districts meeting Alaska EED's established minimum "n" size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. Alaska EED will continue to review these data to examine ongoing impacts of school closures due to the COVID-10 pandemic, including with its stakeholders, and if needed will revise its methodology.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

For the two districts identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the examination of 2019-2020 data, Alaska EED reviewed the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted both as a part of the onsite cyclical monitoring in FFY 2020 and through desk monitoring. The monitoring included reviewing policies, procedures and practices related to IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Alaska EED staff reviewed files for all students with IEPs that were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. When noncompliance is identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, Alaska EED requires districts to revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Alaska verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Alaska's review did not identify noncompliance with the specific requirements related to this indicator as a result of the review in the five districts.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 59.00% | 59.50% | 60.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% |
| A | 66.80% | Data | 63.39% | 63.71% | 64.15% | 65.01% | 64.18% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 12.00% | 12.00% | 11.50% | 9.00% | 9.00% |
| B | 10.29% | Data | 8.84% | 9.05% | 9.17% | 8.90% | 10.47% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.45% | 1.85% |
| C | 2.30% | Data | 2.73% | 2.85% | 2.57% | 2.45% | 2.49% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 66.80% | 67.00% | 67.40% | 67.80% | 68.20% | 68.60% |
| Target B <= | 10.29% | 10.30% | 10.20% | 10.10% | 10.00% | 9.90% |
| Target C <= | 2.30% | 2.30% | 2.20% | 2.20% | 2.10% | 2.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska DEED, with its stakeholders, reviewed the changes to Indicators 5 and 6 due to counting 5 year olds in kindergarten in Indicator 5 and 5 year olds in preschool in Indicator 6. Given the large difference in numbers, especially for 6A, the state is reestablishing baseline data using FFY 2020 data for Indicator 5. The new baseline data aligns with the change in the indicator measurement table.

Alaska's stakeholder supported the targets for this indicator and noted that additional training and supports are needed to help personnel continue to better serve students in less restrictive settings.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 17,760 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 11,864 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,827 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 335 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 50 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 23 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 11,864 | 17,760 | 64.18% | 66.80% | 66.80% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,827 | 17,760 | 10.47% | 10.29% | 10.29% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 408 | 17,760 | 2.49% | 2.30% | 2.30% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

 C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 27.50% | 27.50% | 28.00% | 28.00% | 28.00% |
| **A** | Data | 28.13% | 22.78% | 23.91% | 22.81% | 25.42% |
| **B** | Target <= | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 38.00% |
| **B** | Data | 44.21% | 49.44% | 49.79% | 49.78% | 49.88% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska DEED, with its stakeholders, reviewed the changes to Indicators 5 and 6 due to counting 5 year olds in kindergarten in Indicator 5 and 5 year olds in preschool in Indicator 6. Given the large difference in numbers, especially for 6A, the state is reestablishing baseline data using FFY 2020 data. The new baseline data aligns with the change in the indicator measurement table.

Alaska's stakeholder supported the targets for this indicator and noted that additional training and supports are needed to help personnel continue to better serve students in less restrictive settings. Stakeholders reported areas of need including ensuring that school settings are based on need and not funding sources and training and increased numbers of professionals to make these targets.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 17.90% |
| **B** | 2020 | 54.50% |
| **C** | 2020 | 1.70% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 17.87% | 17.90% | 18.00% | 18.00% | 18.10% | 18.10% |
| Target B <= | 54.50% | 54.40% | 54.30% | 54.20% | 54.10% | 54.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 1.69% | 1.70% | 1.60% | 1.60% | 1.50% | 1.50% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 364 | 727 | 90 | 1,181 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 40 | 147 | 24 | 211 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 212 | 396 | 34 | 642 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 5 | 14 | 1 | 20 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 211 | 1,181 | 25.42% | 17.87% | 17.87% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 644 | 1,181 | 49.88% | 54.50% | 54.53% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 20 | 1,181 |  | 1.69% | 1.69% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for indicators 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State has established baseline for indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# 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 (# 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 (# 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 (# 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 (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 74.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% | 75.50% |
| A1 | 71.60% | Data | 79.97% | 79.90% | 85.10% | 87.00% | 85.61% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 48.00% | 48.00% | 49.00% | 44.00% | 62.00% |
| A2 | 61.90% | Data | 47.70% | 45.03% | 45.88% | 44.84% | 44.37% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 76.80% | 76.80% | 77.00% | 77.30% | 77.30% |
| B1 | 77.20% | Data | 82.74% | 86.10% | 84.80% | 88.21% | 90.52% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 46.00% | 46.00% | 46.50% | 46.50% | 63.90% |
| B2 | 63.80% | Data | 44.67% | 44.69% | 45.65% | 46.56% | 40.35% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 74.60% | 74.60% | 75.00% | 75.20% | 75.20% |
| C1 | 75.10% | Data | 80.58% | 80.67% | 83.18% | 84.59% | 88.05% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 50.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% | 49.00% | 68.80% |
| C2 | 68.70% | Data | 51.63% | 51.71% | 50.57% | 49.89% | 49.46% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 84.26% | 84.50% | 84.70% | 84.90% | 85.10% | 85.30% |
| Target A2 >= | 37.70% | 39.70% | 41.70% | 43.70% | 35.70% | 62.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 85.78% | 86.00% | 86.20% | 86.40% | 86.60% | 86.80% |
| Target B2 >= | 37.85% | 39.90% | 41.90% | 43.90% | 45.90% | 64.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 86.20% | 86.20% | 86.40% | 86.60% | 86.80% | 87.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 44.35% | 46.40% | 48.40% | 50.40% | 52.40% | 70.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

708

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 21 | 2.97% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 81 | 11.44% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 339 | 47.88% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 207 | 29.24% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 60 | 8.47% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 546 | 648 | 85.61% | 84.26% | 84.26% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 267 | 708 | 44.37% | 37.70% | 37.71% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 9 | 1.27% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 85 | 12.01% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 346 | 48.87% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 221 | 31.21% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 47 | 6.64% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 567 | 661 | 90.52% | 85.78% | 85.78% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 268 | 708 | 40.35% | 37.85% | 37.85% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 18 | 2.54% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 73 | 10.31% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 303 | 42.80% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 266 | 37.57% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 48 | 6.78% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 569 | 660 | 88.05% | 86.20% | 86.21% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 314 | 708 | 49.46% | 44.35% | 44.35% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Alaska DEED continued to use seven-point ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form. The data necessary to report for this indicator is collected as part of a Supplemental Workbook that is submitted to the Department on an annual basis for each child.

For indicator 7 each district is required to use the following instructions:
Indicator 7 data must be collected for all children with an IEP ages 3 through 5 who have not yet entered kindergarten. Entry data will be collected in the district within two months of program entry. Exit data will be collected in the district when the child exits due to ineligibility or beginning kindergarten. Districts may use any of the following assessment tools to gather the entry and exit data: Dial 3, Brigance, Battelle, AGS, AEPS, or one approved by Alaska DEED. The data from this form will be reported to Alaska DEED using the Supplemental Workbook. The state will use definitions for the level ratings of all three measurements (Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills, and Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs) as they are already recorded on the Child Outcomes Summary Form.

The criterion for defining “comparable to same age peers” has been defined as a 6 or 7 on the scale.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** 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))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**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.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No**  |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?  | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholder supported the targets for this indicator and are interested to see the impact of COVID-19 and school closures on this indicator. Stakeholders, including parents, are interested in learning more about this indicator and how Alaska can continue to improve in this area.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 29.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 51.00% | 51.00% | 51.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| Data | 52.36% | 62.96% | 60.81% | 62.69% | 67.85% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 56.48% | 57.50% | 58.50% | 59.50% | 60.50% | 61.50% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,051 | 1,861 | 67.85% | 56.48% | 56.48% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

Each survey includes a group of questions that are used for this indicator which are combined for all students. Some questions are asked only to high school parents about transition and preparation for post-school life, but they are not included in analysis for this indicator.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

19,146

**Percentage of respondent parents**

9.72%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 11.65% | 9.72% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Alaska DEED will implement the following strategies to continue to improve the representativeness of the response group: (1) partner more closely with Stone Soup Group, its PTI, and LINKS, the Alaska CPRC, to provide training to parents about the importance of responding to the parent survey and target that training for Alaska Native families of children with IEPs; (2) work with LEAs with high Alaska Native populations to personally remind parents prior to the survey and after they have received the survey; and (3) Increase the number of email addresses collected to facilitate reminders about the survey.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Complete survey and demographic information was collected for 1,861 respondents from a target population of 19,146. This constitutes a 9.7% response rate, an average rate of return for mail-based surveys. The response rate, when coupled with select demographic analyses of respondents, provides a clearer understanding of the validity and accuracy of the survey data. We explored nonresponse bias and examined the representativeness of respondents by ethnicity, disability categories, select demographic characteristics, and sex.

The state has taken and will continue to take the following steps to reduce any bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents: (1) survey all parents annually, providing regular opportunity for feedback; (2) partner with Stone Soup Group and LINKS to provide training to parents and remind parents to respond to the survey; and (3) evaluate the potential use of incentives to increase response rates.

**Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

The demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Alaska examined representativeness by race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, and school district and found the data to be representative (all demographics represented in the sample within +/- 10% of the proportion in the total population). However, there are three areas where Alaska can continue to improve upon that representativeness. For race, Caucasians were over-represented by 8.4% in the results and Alaska Natives were under-represented by 5.0%. All other ethnic and racial subgroups and gender categories were represented within +/- 3% of the proportions of the total population. When examining by disability category, parents of students with Specific Learning Disabilities were under-represented by 8.9% but all others were represented within +/- 3%.

To show continuous improvement in this area for the future, Alaska will continue to implement the strategies described above.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

To determine representativeness, Alaska used the differences between the proportions of the total population and the response group, often referred to as response rate differentials. Given the sample size of nearly 2000 responses and the target group of the total population, Alaska considered response rate differentials within 10% (e.g., +/- 10% discrepancy) to be representative. However, Alaska explored and will implement strategies to address the response rate differentials that were greater than 3% (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy), as noted above and indicated by an asterisk below.

Caucasian 8.4%\*
African American -0.6%
Hispanic -1.1%
Asian 1.2%
Native American 0.2%
Alaska Native -5.0%\*
Multi-Ethnic -1.3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander -1.7%
Unknown 0.0%

Male 2.2%
Female -2.2%

Cognitive Impairment 0.7%
Speech or Language Impairments 1.8%
Emotional Disturbance -0.2%
Other Health Impairments 4.5%\*
Specific Learning Disabilities -8.9%\*
Autism 2.3%
Other Disabilities Combined -0.3%
Unknown 0.1%

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 3.70% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 4 | 0 | 49 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Alaska’s definition of “disproportionate representation”

Alaska EDED stakeholders defined disproportionate representation as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater. The State of Alaska utilizes the risk ratio method to calculate the proportionality of representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in Alaska. Alaska DEED invited a stakeholder group including educators, parents, and other representatives to help define disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The stakeholders reviewed statewide and district by district risk ratio data and agreed to a risk ratio of 2.5.

Alaska uses one year of data in the calculation.

Minimum “n” size
For Indicator 9, Alaska does not include school districts in its analysis in which there are:
Fewer than 10 students with IEPs in the racial/ethnic group of interest, or risk numerator (when examining child count data); and
Fewer than 10 students on the remaining of all other students who serve as the comparison group for that racial/ethnic group of interest (risk denominator).

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Each district identified with a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater is required to complete a self assessment designed to evaluate policies, procedures and practices related to the identification of students as students with disabilities (including requirements related to child find, evaluations and eligibility determinations). The self assessment includes the review of files for students in the race/ethnicity category that was overidentified. Alaska DEED follows up to verify the results of the self-assessment as needed.

The four districts identified in FFY 2020 were NOT found to have disproportionality that was the result of inappropriate identification. Alaska DEED did not make any findings of noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2020.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 6.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

17

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 16 | 0 | 37 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Alaska’s definition of “disproportionate representation”

Alaska DEED stakeholders defined disproportionate representation as a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater. The State of Alaska utilizes the risk ratio and alternate risk ratio methods to calculate the proportionality of representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in Alaska. Alaska DEED invited a stakeholder group including educators, parents, and other representatives to help define disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The stakeholders reviewed statewide and district by district risk ratio data. Since the FFY 2011 APR, Alaska DEED has consistently defined disproportionate representation as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher.

Alaska uses one year of data for calculating disproportionate representation.

Minimum “n” size. For Indicator 10, Alaska does not include school districts in its analysis in which there are:
Fewer than 10 students with IEPs in the racial/ethnic group of interest or the risk numerator (when examining child count data); and
Fewer than 10 students on the remaining of all other students who serve as the comparison group for that racial/ethnic group of interest (risk denominator).

Based on the application of this minimum “n,” 17 of 54 districts were excluded from the calculation for this indicator for FFY 2020.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Each district identified with a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater is required to complete a self assessment designed to evaluate policies, procedures and practices related to the identification of students as students with disabilities (including requirements related to child find, evaluations and eligibility determinations). The self assessment includes the review of files for students in the category that was overidentified. Alaska DEED staff follow up to verify the results of the self assessment as needed.

Alaska reviewed the results of self assessments and results from recent monitoring findings and found that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification in any of the 16 districts.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 95.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.89% | 97.21% | 97.45% | 96.85% | 92.76% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,499 | 2,379 | 92.76% | 100% | 95.20% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

120

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

Of the 120 eligibility determinations completed beyond the timeline: 19 were completed within between 91 and 95 calendar days; 21 were completed between 96 and 105 calendar days; 9 were completed between 106 and 115 days; and 71 were completed after more than 115 calendar days.

The following reasons for delay were reported by school districts: 0 evaluator unable to test due to weather; 81 one or more team members was not available; and 81 for other reasons (5 parent or student delays, 3 teacher delays, 67 COVID school closure delays, and 6 unknown reasons).

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

Alaska DEED's timeline for initial evaluations is within 90 calendar of receiving parental consent for the initial evaluation.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Alaska DEED collects the data for this indicator through an annual data collection from each school district. Data are collected once each year for the full reporting period and include all students in all school districts.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska DEED determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific IDEA and Alaska requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the initial evaluation timelines) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or data collections. Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA, and through compliance monitoring. Alaska DEED followed up the data collection with phone calls to LEAs and review of files as necessary to establish 100% compliance. Findings were verified as corrected when data showed 100% compliance for a time period following the finding of noncompliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska DEED verified that every individual case of noncompliance was corrected unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. For timeline-specific requirements, like Indicator 11, Alaska verified that each required action, although late, occurred. Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA and through compliance monitoring. Alaska DEED followed up the data collection with phone calls to LEAs and review of files as necessary to establish that each evaluation occurred, although late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

 a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

 b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

 c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

 d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

 e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

 f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 74.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.10% | 97.70% | 92.63% | 96.02% | 94.44% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 298 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 28 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 226 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.  | 20 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 5 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 226 | 245 | 94.44% | 100% | 92.24% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Many of the delays during the 2020-2021 year were due to districts and local ILP programs implementing new procedures for serving children and for transition during school closures due to COVID-19. Alaska DEED expects to see higher compliance during the 2021-2022 school year when there have been fewer school closures but recognizes the ongoing impact of COVID-19 on families and schools.

Alaska DEED continues to be concerned about the decrease in the number of total referrals over the past several years (from 486 in FFY 2017; 401 in FFY 2018; 323 in FFY 2019; to 298 in FFY 2020). This is the lowest number of referrals since 2008-09. (FFY 2008)Alaska DEED will work together with the ILP program to ensure all potentially eligible children are referred and that children who may not have been served by ILP are found through district child find efforts.

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

19

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

Of the 19 eligibilities determined or IEPs developed beyond the 3rd birthday: 3 were completed between 1 and 10 days after the 3rd birthday; 3 were completed between 11 and 30 days after the 3rd birthday; 7 were completed between 31 and 60 days after the 3rd birthday; and 6 were completed 61 or more days after the 3rd birthday.

Of the 19 eligibilities determined or IEPs developed beyond the 3rd birthday, 1 was not completed because a member of the team did not complete the process by the child's 3rd birthday and the remaining 18 were not completed for other reasons including school closures and inability to conduct evaluations due to COVID-19.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Alaska DEED collects the data for this indicator through the annual supplemental data collection from each school district. Data reported for this indicator are based solely on the referrals made to LEAs from local Infant Learning Programs (ILPs). The state did not receive notifications from the Part C program (ILP) during the FFY 2020 reporting period. LEA data for Indicator 12 are collected once each year for the full reporting period and include all students in all school districts that are referred from Part C during the year.

The procedures for the supplemental data collection include specific written guidance, an annual webinar describing the data to be reported, and individual LEA technical assistance as needed, emphasizing the population on whom to report for this indicator. To increase the accuracy of data reported, the instructions for the supplemental collection include the following statement, which is emphasized in all trainings: "Remember, this data collection is only for students who were referred to you from an ILP and who were on an IFSP at the time of the referral."

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska DEED determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific IDEA or Alaska requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or data collections. For findings related to Indicator 12, Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA, and through compliance monitoring.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska DEED verified that every individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. For timeline-specific requirements, like Indicator 12, Alaska DEED verified that each required action, although late, occurred.

Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA, and through compliance monitoring, where evidence was reviewed that the IEPs were completed, although late, for each child referred.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 96.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.65% | 96.95% | 97.91% | 96.93% | 95.05% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,627 | 3,782 | 95.05% | 100% | 95.90% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Alaska DEED collects the data for this indicator through an annual data collection from each school district. Data are collected once each year for the full reporting period and include all students in all districts.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?  | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska DEED determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific IDEA or Alaska requirements for secondary transition (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with secondary transition requirements) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or data collections. Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA and through compliance monitoring. Alaska followed up the data collection with phone calls to LEAs and review of files as necessary to establish 100% compliance. Findings were verified as corrected when data showed 100% compliance for a time period following the finding of noncompliance for each finding.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska DEED verified that every individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. For Indicator 13, Alaska collected data to verify that each IEP was corrected and that IEP meetings were reconvened as needed. Data were collected through data submissions and compliance monitoring. Alaska followed up the data collection with phone calls to LEAs and review of files as necessary to establish that all of the requirements for secondary transition were met for each student.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

 A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

 B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.70% | 13.00% | 16.25% |
| A | 16.20% | Data | 13.48% | 15.00% | 13.41% | 13.17% | 12.91% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 43.40% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 56.00% | 59.25% |
| B | 59.20% | Data | 49.41% | 55.53% | 53.18% | 56.72% | 54.49% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 61.00% | 61.50% | 61.50% | 68.00% | 70.55% |
| C | 70.50% | Data | 63.83% | 66.05% | 66.12% | 68.28% | 62.36% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 8.10% | 9.00% | 10.00% | 11.00% | 12.00% | 16.30% |
| Target B >= | 58.80% | 59.00% | 59.20% | 59.40% | 59.60% | 59.80% |
| Target C >= | 67.18% | 67.50% | 68.00% | 68.50% | 69.50% | 70.60% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska stakeholder supported the targets for this indicator and are interested to see the impact of COVID-19 and school closures on this indicator. Stakeholders, including parents, provided feedback on strategies the state might use to continue to improve including doing better to make sure students have needed supports when they do continue on to higher education; considering the cost of higher education and supporting students and families to access financial support; and ensuring that we place appropriate value on job training, apprenticeships (formal or informal), and trade/skills schools. Alaska DEED will use this feedback along with feedback on the SSIP to inform the training and supports it develops for schools and districts.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 1,147 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 454 |
| Response Rate | 39.58% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 37 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 230 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 37 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 1 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 37 | 454 | 12.91% | 8.10% | 8.15% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 267 | 454 | 54.49% | 58.80% | 58.81% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 305 | 454 | 62.36% | 67.18% | 67.18% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate  | 38.96% | 39.58% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

A census of all former students who received special education services in their final year of school was conducted. The Alaska DEED Office of Special Education provided a list of 2019-2020 School Exiters to SESA and Alaska Research and Evaluation Services with the last known address and telephone numbers of former students from individual school districts. These data were shared with Alaska Research and Evaluation Services to conduct the data collection. Postcards were sent to the target population in advance of the telephone survey in order to heighten awareness and encourage participation. We will continue to employ these strategies to maintain the high response rate.

Complete survey and demographic information was collected for 454 respondents from a target population of 1,147. This constitutes a 39.6% response rate, a strong rate of return for telephonic surveys.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The response rate, when coupled with select demographic analyses of respondents, provides a clearer understanding of the validity and accuracy of the survey data. All groups including dropouts were represented and there does not appear to be nonresponse bias.

Alaska has taken and will continue to take the following steps to reduce potential bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth: (1) send postcards in advance of the telephone survey; (2) partner with DVR and other agencies serving youth who have left school to encourage responses; (3) evaluate the potential use of incentives to increase response rates.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Alaska DEED examined representativeness of respondents by ethnicity, disability categories, select demographic characteristics, and sex. Overall, survey data are representative of the Target Population in all categories (within +/- 3%). Response rate differentials have improved year over year.

2021 Response Rate Differentials:
Caucasian 2.8%
African American -0.9%
Hispanic -0.6%
Asian -0.9%
Native American -0.1%
Alaska Native -1.3%
Multi-Ethnic 0.6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 0.2%
Unknown 0.0%

Learning Disabled -0.3%
Emotionally Disturbed -0.3%
Intellectual Disability -0.8%
All Other Disability Categories (Low incidence categories) 1.4%

Female -0.6%
Minority -2.8%
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) -0.8%
Dropouts 1.3%

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

All ethnic and racial subgroups, and disability types were proportional within +/- 3% of the target population.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 14 - Required Actions

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** 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))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 1 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 1 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 73.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 70.00%-80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 25.00% | 16.67% | 100.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2020 (low)** | **2020 (high)** | **2021 (low)** | **2021 (high)** | **2022 (low)** | **2022 (high)** | **2023 (low)** | **2023 (high)** | **2024 (low)** | **2024 (high)** | **2025 (low)** | **2025 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target >= | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target (low)** | **FFY 2020 Target (high)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 | 0.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 1 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 78.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 70.00%-80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2020 (low)** | **2020 (high)** | **2021 (low)** | **2021 (high)** | **2022 (low)** | **2022 (high)** | **2023 (low)** | **2023 (high)** | **2024 (low)** | **2024 (high)** | **2025 (low)** | **2025 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target >= | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target (low)** | **FFY 2020 Target (high)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 100.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 0.00% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

While the data show slippage, the very small number of mediation sessions lead to variability from year to year. Alaska DEED is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

Alaska’s State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is to increase graduation rates of Alaska Native students with disabilities, as measured by the state-calculated five-year cohort graduation rate.

Alaska’s "five-year graduation rate" is calculated by means of a fraction. The denominator is an adjusted graduation cohort consisting of the sum of the number of students who first enrolled in the ninth grade five years earlier, adjusting for transfers in and out, emigres, and deceased students. The numerator is the number of students in the school who graduate (A) on or before June 30 of the reporting year; (B) with a regular high school diploma; and (C) within five years of first enrolling in a high school. (4 AAC 06.825. Graduation rates indicator)

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.**

Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (Alaska DEED) completed a systems analysis to understand implications for changing its SiMR and infrastructure in place to improve equitable outcomes for Alaska Native students with disabilities. First, Alaska DEED examined current SSIP activities that improve Alaska DEED capacity, improve school capacity, provide opportunities for students, build family – school relationships, and available culturally responsive programming to determined alignment. Specifically, this included professional development opportunities available to Alaska DEED staff, school resources and training opportunities (including culturally relevant programming), curricula for job and independent skills in high school and opportunities for work experience, and strategies for engaging parents and stakeholders. Alaska DEED staff noted that SSIP activities currently in place positively impact Native Alaska students with disabilities and recent efforts to develop and make available culturally responsive programming to Alaska Native students with disabilities align with the change in SiMR.

Next, Alaska DEED reviewed other infrastructure already in place to support changes to the SiMR. This includes other Alaska DEED-funded programs, and local programming that could be leveraged. Outside of its SSIP work, Alaska DEED looked to other initiatives that focus on Alaska Native students. Most notably, Alaska’s ESSA State Plan, Special Education Service Agency (SESA), Alaska Work Matters Task Force, and Alaska CAN! already have goals and systems in place to support improving services and supports to Alaska Native students. Alaska’s ESSA plan is designed to leverage and disseminate culturally relevant instructional practices and resources. The SESA is also working to develop and disseminate Alaska Traditional Transition Skills curricula. The Alaska Work Matters Task Force has a specific focus on students with disabilities and enhancing rural traditional skill development. Alaska CAN! has a specific focus on Alaska Native students and tracks data separately for the subpopulation.

Alaska DEED staff and stakeholders also discussed different needs across the state based on school district characteristics, including district size and make up, for which supports will be differentiated. For all school districts, the dissemination of appropriate information and resources was identified as an overall priority. Specifically, in smaller districts, student needs may vary considerably based on regional cultures including participation in local subsistence activities. Appropriate culturally responsive programming and opportunities that meet unique needs were identified as potential levers for change.

While Alaska stakeholders recognize that graduation rates will fluctuate from year to year, the goal of the new SSIP targets is to increase 5-year cohort graduation rates for Alaska Native students with disabilities to 70% by 2025, which exceeds the FFY2020 5-year cohort graduation for all students with disabilities. By specifically focusing on 5-year cohort data, Alaska DEED’s goal is to inherently improve the 4-year cohort graduation rates and the overall graduation rate across the state.

**Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR**.

4 and 5-year cohort graduation rate data from school years 16-17, 17-18, 18-19, 19-20, and 20-21. The data were disaggregated and analyzed based on multiple factors including disability category, gender, school location and type, and race and ethnicity.

**Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.**

The Alaska DEED Data Manager compiled graduation data for 5 years for both 4-year and 5-year cohort data for the following student groups: all students with disabilities, previously identified priority and focus schools, 5 largest school districts, all school districts excluding largest 5, disability categories SLD, OHI, and SI, economically disadvantaged, SPED environment, and new accountability CSI schools. Alaska DEED team then reviewed the n size for each subgroup and determined that it would only consider student groups with an n size of larger than 300 (approximately 25% of total population of students with disabilities) to account for volatility issues across years.

The team then analyzed disparities between student groups, Alaska DEED noted a large discrepancy between graduation rates of Alaska Native students with disabilities compared to all students with disabilities statewide. Alaska DEED completed further analysis to better understand how the graduation rate of Alaska Native students with disabilities impacted its overall graduation rate for students with disabilities. Using data for both 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation rates across 5 years, Alaska DEED calculated the graduation rates for Alaska Native students with disabilities, all students with disabilities, and all students with disabilities excluding Alaska Native students (Year - Alaska Native Students with Disabilities; All Students with Disabilities; All Students with Disabilities excluding Alaska Native Students. 5-Year Cohort; 2016 – 59%; 66%; 69%; 2017 – 64%; 65%; 65%; 2018 – 65%; 67%; 68%; 2019 – 66%; 68%; 68%; 2020 – 61%; 69%; 73%. 4-Year Cohort: 2016 - 48%; 54%; 57%; 2017- 55%; 59%; 60%; 2018- 53%; 57%; 58%; 2019 – 54%; 60%; 63%; 2020- 56%; 59%; 60%). Alaska DEED noted the largest discrepancy between Alaska Native students with disabilities and all students with disabilities excluding Alaska Native students within its 5-year cohort data in FY20 (12% when comparing Alaska Native students with disabilities to all students with disabilities excluding Alaska Native students). It is important to note that many of the previously identified priority schools are in districts with a large percent of Alaska Native students with disabilities. The 41 previously identified target schools are part of 13 school districts: 8 (91% or more Alaska Native students), 2 (60%- 90% Alaska Native students), and 3 (less than 59% Alaska Native students).

Based on the substantial difference of graduation rates when comparing 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation data, Alaska DEED proposed a change in its SiMR to stakeholders to target efforts that focus on equitable outcomes and opportunities for Alaska Native students with disabilities. While 4-year cohort data also illustrated graduation rate discrepancies, the gap between student groups was smaller (2016: 4-year cohort of 9% compared to 5-year cohort data of 10%; 2020: 4-year cohort of 4% compared to 5-year cohort data of 12%) and demonstrated disproportionate gains for Alaska Native students during 2016-2020 when comparing 4-year and 5-year cohort data.

**Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.**

The role of stakeholders in the identification of the revised SiMR began with an analysis of the previous SiMR to determine whether a revision was necessary. The small number of special education students in graduation cohorts in previously identified priority schools (42 schools) have historically experienced large fluctuations in performance from year to year mainly based on the fact that cohorts in many of these schools had zero special education students in any given year. The variation in size of the cohort in each target school, added to the small overall number being reported in the SSIP have led to variations in the data, contributing to strong volatility in graduation rates. Given data volatility, limited Alaska DEED resources, and significant geographic areas between schools, Alaska DEED stakeholders, the Governor’s Council, and the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC) determined a need to revise its SSIP targets and baseline.

AITC members then discussed potential subgroups of interest to analyze data, as included above. Upon analysis of the data, the group decided on Alaska Native students as its area of focus for the SSIP. Alaska DEED then developed information for dissemination including previous targets and data, reasons for changing the SiMR, data supporting the change, infrastructure already in place, and prompts for discussion. Alaska DEED staff offered 3 stakeholder meeting times to review all SPP/APR indicators and targets including the SSIP, 1 stakeholder meeting specifically for the SSIP, and disseminated a survey.

During these meetings, Alaska DEED stakeholders, the Governor’s Council, parents, and the AITC reviewed 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation rate data and offered prompts to discuss factors that may be contributing to lower graduation rates for Alaska Native students with disabilities compared to all students with disabilities including impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, disproportionate access to resources (rural vs urban districts), and appropriate programming and curricula (specifically culturally responsive programming and curriculum for Alaska Native students). Additional focus was placed on considering supports and opportunities available for students with disabilities and specifically for Alaska Native students with disabilities to maximize opportunities to receive a diploma including whether a focus on the 4-year cohort graduation rate inadvertently impacts opportunities to receive a diploma within 5 years and if opportunities are equitably provided regardless of race/ethnicity and geographic location.

Stakeholders discussed implications for revising its focus group including infrastructure in place to support the change both within Alaska DEED and broader stakeholders and the impact this effort could have on the graduation rates of all students with disabilities statewide (Indicator 1). Stakeholders also had the opportunity to provide input on SSIP targets and engage in conversations around equity and access.

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

Alaska Native students with disabilities.

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

An accessible version of Alaska DEED's current theory of action is posted at https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SPED/docs/Alaska-State-Systemic-Improvement%20-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf. It is included with links to the SPP/APR and SSIP on the special education page of the DEED website (https://education.alaska.gov/sped).

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or** **justification for the changes.**

The change in SiMR has impacted the state’s implementation of the SSIP, evaluation plan, and Logic Model. In prior years, the AITC has focused activities and resources on building the capacity of priority schools. The new SSIP target will focus on activities that improve the capacity of schools across the state to implement previously identified evidence-based practices and curricula, and scale up efforts to incorporate culturally responsive programming and supports for its implementation, dissemination, and sustainability.

Activities and strategies will be implemented immediately. Activities include:
1. Distributing training materials and resources to educators specifically those that include culturally responsive programming for rural districts with large Alaska Native students with disabilities;
2. Incorporating culturally responsive programming into the statewide transition training;
3. Making available, developing and/or modifying curricula to incorporate culturally responsive programming for Alaska Native students; and
4. Increasing trainings specifically for parents who identify as Alaska Native to promote collaborative relationships between parents and school professional.

Strategies include:
1. Increasing collaboration between agencies who focus on strategic priorities that positively impact Alaska Native students, specifically ESSA team, CTE team, SESA, and TVR;
2. Increasing knowledge of strategic priorities aimed at improving graduation rates and outcomes for Alaska Native students; and
3. Improving community integration and involvement for Alaska Native students and families.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 60.57% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 60.57% | 62.00% | 64.00% | 66.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The number of Native American students with an IEP who graduated from high school within five years with a regular high school diploma.** | **The total number of Native American students with an IEP who started 9th grade 5 years earlier.** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 235 | 388 |  | 60.57% | 60.57% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Graduation data is submitted annually by LEAs to the Department through the Summer OASIS data collection. The data collection contains a record for every entry and exit for students between July 1 through June 30. Data is due to the department annually on July 15.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

Upon receipt, graduation data is reviewed and certified by the Alaska DEED Data Manager for reporting purposes. Data are cross referenced with supporting documentation and transcripts. LEAs are provided a timeframe to make any data corrections. The data manager disaggregates data by the following populations to determine the 5-year cohort graduation rate: Alaska Native students with disabilities, all students with disabilities, and students with disabilities excluding Alaska Native students.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (Alaska DEED) analyzes various data sources to evaluate progress toward the SiMR. Alaska DEED understands that graduation rates improve based on many contributing factors.

Research demonstrates the strong correlation between attendance and graduation rates. Attendance rates of students with disabilities are considered a key indicator to help Alaska DEED inform strategic interventions to reduce dropouts and improve graduation rates and post school outcomes. Attendance data is monitored to assess the impact of strategic academic interventions including participation in Career and Technical Education (CTE) and work experiences. The average attendance of Alaska Native students with disabilities: school year 19-20: 90%; 20-21: 91% (statewide school year 19-20: 93%; 20-21: 92%). In school year 19-20, 16.7% of CTE participants identified as Alaska Native and 12.1% of CTE participants were students with disabilities, as defined by IDEA. Additionally, Indicator 13 data are disaggregated and examined to determine the percentage of youth with an IEP that includes all required components (all students with disabilities: 95.9%; Alaska Native students with disabilities: 95.86%).

Alaska DEED collected data related to participation, content, and evaluation of training opportunities for educators with the goal of improving equitable distribution and implementation of evidence-based practices across the state. During the Fall 2020 Statewide Transition Training, 63 educators across 23 school districts participated. Participants participated in an evaluation survey following each session which focused on the quality, relevance, and usefulness of sessions (in the fall of 2021: 100% reported the quality the trainings as very good or excellent). These surveys are also used to determine which evidence-based practices are in use.

The Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC) partners created an online platform, Transition Alaska, in school year 19-20 to increase access to information and resources for stakeholders across the state. This was in part in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, a strategy used to increase implementation of evidence-based practices in schools and districts across the state given the large geographic area, and strategic modification to the original scale-up plan in Phase II. Data on the total number of accounts, new annual accounts created, and the number of tools and resources (added by year) are collected.

Providing students access to training and educational opportunities with the goal of improving post-secondary outcomes and bolstering graduation rates is a key strategy of the AITC. Research demonstrates that improved engagement in the classroom plays an important role in the overall learning processes and improved academic performance. Participation and evaluation data related to the many student-centered activities offered is collected including ATOP Transition Camps (240 students in person, 153 students virtually in 12 camps), JOBZ Club (34 students), S’Cool Store (44 students), Pathways (11 students), and Summer Work (302 students) were collected.

To determine the impact that access to culturally responsive curricula has on graduation rates for Alaska Native students with disabilities, data is collected to track whether modifications have been made to previously developed resources and materials to incorporate culturally responsive programming and new materials and resources made available specifically tailored to Native Alaska students with disabilities that can be included as part of a student’s Individual Education Plan (IEP) and transition plan.

Recognizing that parent involvement and support is associated with higher student achievement, data related to parent involvement and perception were also collected to inform efforts to provide tools and trainings that facilitated conversations about graduation and secondary transition with parents.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

An accessible version of Alaska DEED's revised SSIP evaluation plan is posted at https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SPED/docs/Alaska-DEED-State-Systemic-Improvement-Evaluation-Plan-by-Priority-Area.pdf. It is included with links to the SPP/APR and SSIP on the special education page of the DEED website (https://education.alaska.gov/sped).

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

The State updated its evaluation plan to reflect activities that align with its updated SiMR baseline and target data, specifically focusing on Alaska Native students with disabilities. While many of the outcomes and previously identified strategies were continued, the AITC increased focus on culturally responsive programming and accessibility of rural school districts with large populations of Alaska Native students across each strategic priority.

New outcomes include:
1. Increasing collaboration between agencies who focus on strategic priorities that positively impact Alaska Native students;
2. Increasing knowledge of strategic priorities aimed at improving graduation rates and outcomes for Alaska Native students;
3. Increasing the distribution of training materials and resources specifically those that include culturally responsive programming for rural districts with large Alaska Native students with disabilities;
4. Incorporating culturally responsive programming into statewide transition training;
5. Making available, developing and/or modifying curricula to incorporate culturally responsive programming; and
6. Providing training specifically for parents who identify as Alaska Native to promote collaborative relationships between parents and school professionals.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The SiMR previously measured graduation rates for priority schools across the state. The SiMR will now measure graduation rates for Alaska Native students with disabilities, as measured by 5-year cohort data. Due to these changes in the SiMR baseline and target data, modifications were needed for the evaluation plan.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Access to Trainings and Resources
In response to efforts to increase accessibility due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Alaska DEED and AITC partners, continued to modify training curricula offered to target school districts and statewide and developed additional training opportunities for educators. The establishment of a formal relationship between the AITC and Alaska Career & Technical Education (ACTE) staff increased the dissemination of these materials beyond special education staff to also include the Statewide CTE Listserv and Counselors Listserv, which is believed to have contributed to increased participation in its Statewide Secondary Transition training and newsletter audience. The AITC continued to refine, enhance, and expand offerings through the Transition Alaska site (https://transitionalaska.org/). The site also hosted virtual events including 6 Transition Camps for students and the Annual Statewide Transition Training.

Improve Alaska DEED Capacity
Alaska DEED continued to invest significant resources to increase the capacity of Alaska DEED staff to oversee, manage, and coordinate SSIP activities. With the assistance of technical assistance centers, Alaska DEED assumed all responsibilities to administer and coordinate all AITC and SSIP activities with limited support. Throughout the reporting period, Alaska DEED staff continued to utilize NTACT’s universal technical assistance, further decreasing its involvement in support needed to coordinate and implement activities. Alaska DEED staff participated in 29 professional development trainings and incorporated practices and resources into AITC activities.

Improve School Capacity
Alaska continued all strategies for improving school capacity. In the fall of 2021, the AITC hosted its second annual Statewide Secondary Transition Training. Based on feedback and reflections on its initial statewide training in the fall of 2020, the AITC made improvements to the structure of the event to maximize learning including offering pre-training recorded sessions and materials to create more advanced learning opportunities, flexible afternoon and morning sessions, and more time for peer sharing and problem solving. Additionally, as a result of its participation in professional development and training opportunities, Alaska DEED staff integrated and provided trainings on NTACT developed evidence-based practices. The quarterly transition newsletter continued to inform teachers about professional development opportunities, information on evidence-based practices, and examples of implementation across Alaska.

Provide Opportunities for Students
Alaska continued and scaled up its provision of transition services and opportunities to students with disabilities. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) paid teacher stipends to implement curriculums that teach students necessary skills for transition and graduation through Pathways, JOBZ Club, and S’Cool Store. Alaska DEED relies on voluntary participation to implement curriculums within schools. ATOP Transition Camps were offered both in-person and virtually, totaling 12 offerings.

DVR also facilitated opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in job opportunities through local employers in small businesses. During June-July 2020, 112 students participated in the summer work program and in June-July 2021, 190 students participated. Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs and opportunities to participate in activities at regional hubs are supplemental activities to successfully prepare students for graduation and secondary transition.

Build Family – School Relationships
Stone Soup Group (SSG) Parent Navigators continued work to build collaborative relationships between families and schools by offering support in one-on-one or group settings. During the reporting period, parent navigators provided 465 parent trainings statewide.

SSG continued to highlight the importance of supporting families and students to improve graduation and post-secondary outcomes. At the Virtual Parent Conference in April 2021, SSG hosted sessions on employment (23 attendees), inclusion in the military (24 attendees), and inclusion in the community (17 attendees). Throughout the reporting period, SSG also hosted virtual sessions including the following: Virtual Transition Fair for Students with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Services & Their Families, Empowerment Through Employment and Transitions Handbook Overview, and Virtual Job Fair.

Alaska DEED continued to collect and monitor responses related to six transition questions included in its APR Parent Involvement (Indicator 8) survey (2,655 responses in 20-21, 20.3% identified as Alaska Native). This data was compared to results from the 19-20 data collection to determine percent change:
1) It is important to me that my child receives a high school diploma/ graduates from high school. (20-21: 97% of parents agree; 19-20: 73%; 103% increase)
2) My child’s IEP team talks about possible employment or careers after high school. (20-21:73% of parents agree, 19-20: 37%; 137% increase)
3) My child’s IEP team talks about possible employment training and/or college after high school. (20-21: 73% of parents agree; 19-20: 35%; 137% increase)
4) I have talked with my child about possible employment or careers after high school. (20-21: 96% of parents agree; 19-20: 53%; 104% increase)
5) I have talked with my child about possible employment training and/or college after high school. (20-21: 93% of parents agree; 19-20: 53%; 107% increase)
6) I expect that my child will participate in subsistence activities during their adult life. (20-21: 75% of parents agree; 19-20: 39%; 138% increase)

The data collected will be used to inform future training and resource offerings. Alaska DEED and AITC stakeholders have worked to better understand the large percent change in parent responses. Contributing factors may include educator participation in Statewide Secondary Transition Training, and decrease in parent response rate (20-21: 2,655 compared to 19-20: 3,136). Data in future years will be examined to determine long terms trends.

Culturally Responsive Programs
Given the new targets of the SSIP, a priority of the AITC has been to analyze how culturally responsive programming can best be incorporated into current trainings, resources, and strategic partnerships. During the last reporting period, AITC stakeholders specifically worked to better understand accessibility implications for rural districts with large percentages of Alaska Native students with the goal of increasing access, participation, and relevance. Based on outreach to Districts and collaboration between AITC stakeholders, strategies were identified to increase distribution of resources to rural districts, a resource was revised to explore subsistence lifestyles in relation to self-employment, and two new curriculums focused on Alaska Traditional Transition Skills were made available.

Recognizing the unique needs of Alaska Native students with disabilities, access to culturally responsive programming and resources is a key lever to make progress towards SiMR goals. These resources in addition to other evidence-based practices are the foundation for systems improvement efforts to target this subgroup of students. Increasing the number of resources available will enable educators to customize offerings to students to improve outcomes. By leveraging other infrastructure improvement strategies, the AITC is working to scale-up dissemination and implementation across the state.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Improve Alaska DEED Capacity (Governance; Professional Development and/or Technical Assistance)
Alaska DEED staff continued to increase capacity to more meaningfully participate and apply learnings from professional development activities to improve AITC activities. Outcomes included an analysis of necessary stakeholders and partnerships to increase visibility of the AITC and its resources to increase coordination between agencies. This led to the ACTE joining as a formal stakeholder and member of the AITC.

Alaska DEED staff were also able to successfully facilitate trainings as part of formal technical assistance for educators. These trainings were formerly conducted by NTACT as part of the Statewide Secondary Transition Training. Alaska DEED staff also identified and incorporated three NTACT developed evidence-based practices into trainings and made them available for wider dissemination.

Activities enable staff to create infrastructure and systems that sustain improvement efforts through the meaningful participation and coordination of the AITC as its facilitator, organizer, and coordinator of activities. Through its leadership and collaboration with partners it has been able to identify strategies that scale-up activities across the state including its Statewide Secondary Transition Training and Transition Alaska online repository of resources.

Improve School Capacity (Professional Development and/or Technical Assistance and Quality Standards)
Short-term outcomes included better than anticipated participation in the AITC’s Statewide Secondary Transition Training. In Fall 2020, the AITC facilitated a virtual 4-part Statewide Secondary Transition Training for 63 educators, across 23 school districts. In the Fall of 2021, the AITC facilitated its second Annual Statewide Secondary Transition Training for 117 educators, across 32 school districts. This resulted in an 85.71% increase in participation and 39% increase in district representation. Improvements in content and format of these trainings resulted in improved evaluation results (2020: 88% reported the quality of the trainings as very good or excellent; 2021: 100% reported the quality the trainings as very good or excellent).

In January of 2021, the AITC was able to increase its newsletter recipients from 92 to 253, a 175% increase. This large increase in survey recipients is mainly attributed to large participation of educators in Alaska’s Statewide Secondary Transition Training.

Virtual Access to Trainings and Resources (Professional Development and/or Technical Assistance)
Due to increasing utilization and participation of stakeholders using virtual platforms, specifically as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, Alaska DEED in collaboration with AITC partners, have developed a number of new data collection mechanisms to track and assess the utility and relevance of new technological platforms and resources. Transition Alaska tracks participation, location, and download data for parents, students, and educators. Currently the website has 437 users, 137 user accounts were created during 19-20 and 299 accounts were created during 20-21 (a 218% increase in new users). Of the 299 new user accounts, 26 student and 273 adult accounts were created. Since its inception, 4 training series have been added to the resource hub: ATOP Transition Camp, Brightways Series, Using EYTG, and Secondary Transition Series. These trainings have received more than 38 watch hours.

The Transition Alaska website is viewed as an important mechanism for sustaining improvement and scale-up efforts.

Provide Opportunities for Students (Fiscal and Governance)
AITC partners apply for and use SEA funds to provide opportunities for students to participate in opportunities grounded in evidence-based practices and curricula including ATOP Transition Camps, JOBZ Club, S’Cool Store, Pathways, and Summer Work.

As part of participation in ATOP Transition Camps, SERRC implemented the collection of pre and post assessment evaluations to demonstrate the value and impact it has on students. Pre and post assessment results are included below as percent change:
I have some ideas about what I want to do for work after high school. (20% increase)
I know how to apply for vocational training programs. (25% increase)
I am familiar with Alaska’s Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) Services. (37% increase)
I am familiar with Tribal Vocational Rehabilitation (TVR) Services. (25% increase)
I know the supports that Job Center provides. (52% increase)
I know about how my community can support me in achieving my goals. (22% increase)

Participation of students with disabilities in Summer Work programs continues to gain increased student participation. The percent increase in students who participated in Summer Work between 2020 to 2021 was 41% (2020: 112 students; 2021: 190 students). Each student who participated was placed in a job with a local employer. In 2021, the number of local individual employers totaled 70.

Given increasing reliance on online platforms to provide services to students across the state, DVR developed a number of technological enhancements to its website to improve coordination and collaboration between schools and DVR, including a new search function to put educators in direct contact with their local DVR counselor and improving online registration functionality for events.

Providing opportunities for students to receive appropriate instruction and interventions is in direct support of achieving the SiMR. Availability of these opportunities free of charge across the state contributes to widespread adoption, scale-up, and participation.

Collaborate to Build Family – School Relationships (Governance)
In FFY2021, SSG was appointed head of the School Workgroup for the Shared Vision Project, charged with envisioning a system that supports students with disabilities. The Shared Vision project is a collaborative effort consisting of organizations across the state with the goal of empowering people with disabilities to take the lead in determining how they want to live and directing the support needed to live the life they choose. The collaborative produced a video for transition teachers describing the Shared Vision and providing resources and guidance on how to implement this approach with students in the classroom (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eoJAuCQ4mks&feature=youtu.be).

Increasing knowledge, access, and the capacity of parents allows them to serve as advocates and act as supports to ensure that students receive the instruction, interventions, and skills necessary to successfully graduate from high school. Networks of parents, community organizations, and stakeholders creates sustainable systems for improvement efforts and wider dissemination and support which contribute to achieving the SiMR. Virtual methods for building community connections and family engagement has scaled up participation across the state.

Culturally Responsive Programs (Professional Development and/or Technical Assistance and Quality Standards)
The AITC made available two new Alaska Traditional Transition Skills curriculums, developed by the SESA, that work to demonstrate how transitional skills can be supported and integrated into transition planning for youth with IEPs. These new curriculums focused on Traditional Carving and Stewardship and Harvest of the Land.

Additionally, the Pathways Bridge to CTE resource was updated to include information on self-employment through subsistence activities. Through its efforts to understand tribal programs and modify current curriculum opportunities, DVR hopes to increase participation of local Alaska Native populations to explore how subsistence skills and activities can be used to promote self-employment in these regions.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Each of the infrastructure improvement strategies included in this report will continue in Phase III, year 7 of SSIP implementation.

Improve Alaska DEED Capacity
Alaska DEED staff will continue to participate in professional development opportunities to learn from technical assistance centers including NTACT, IDC, and NCSI. Monthly AITC stakeholder meetings will continue to be facilitated and ran by Alaska DEED staff to coordinate and implement SSIP activities. During year 7, Alaska DEED plans to strengthen partnerships with ACTE, TVR and the ESSA team to leverage partnerships and infrastructures that are already in place to make progress towards shared goals of increasing graduation rates and post school success.

Improve School Capacity
Due to continued positive feedback and participation, the AITC plans to continue to conduct its annual virtual statewide secondary transition training for educators to increase capacity and facilitate the implementation of evidence-based practices in the fall of 2022. AITC stakeholders will continue to present during the ASSEC to circulate evidence-based practices, priorities, and opportunities to educators across the state (4 sessions focused on graduation and secondary transition will take place in February 2022). The Alaska ACTE in conjunction with Alaska CAN! (Alaska’ Postsecondary Access and Completion Network) will present on Equity and Access during its 7th Annual conference. The goal of Alaska CAN! Is to increase the percentage of working-age Alaskans who hold postsecondary credentials – from apprenticeship or certificate completion to advanced degrees – to 65% by the year 2025. Data is tracked separately for all students and Alaska Native students.

The AITC will continue to use Transition Alaska as a resource hub for educators, parents, and students to disseminate resources and information about AITC opportunities. Quarterly newsletters will also continually inform special education personnel about evidence-based practices, opportunities, and the state’s progress in implementing the SSIP.

Provide Services and Opportunities for Students
DVR and SERRC will continue to offer Pathways, JOBZ Club, S’Cool Store, and ATOP Transition Camp opportunities both to the target district and statewide to improve attendance rates, graduation rates, and post-secondary outcomes.

ACTE recently received grant for the development of a clearing house to store CTE lessons in a searchable database. Upon completion, this clearing house will be available to all educators across the state. Collaboration with the AITC will continue to ensure that resources accessible on Transition Alaska are included in the repository and more widely available. Additionally, the ACTE is working to develop culturally responsive CTE programming in hopes to meet the needs of more remote and rural school districts with high percentages of Alaska Native students.

Collaborate to Build Family – School Relationships
Alaska DEED will track APR Parent Involvement (Indicator 8) survey results related to 6 transition questions and bring the results back to the AITC to better understand and address the needs of parents through SSG’s Parent Navigators located statewide. During the next reporting period, Alaska DEED staff will disaggregate parent response data for Alaska Native parents and compare responses to all parents to determine if data are comparable between the two groups and opportunities to improve services to parents who identify as Alaska Native.

This data will also be used to inform SSG’s parent trainings and sessions at the Annual Parent Conference and future lecture series. SSG will hosted a 6-part transition series, between September 2021 – April 2022, and a Statewide Virtual Jobs Club and Virtual Business Week in the spring of 2022. Additionally, SSG plans to leverage the Transition Alaska platform to advertise resources and increase support across the state.

Culturally Responsive Programs
As a result of the analysis completed during the reporting period, the AITC identified connectivity issues in rural districts for accessing materials. DVR and TVR are working to print and distribute the Exploring Transition Goals Workbook to rural schools. Additional activities include encouraging local subsistence mentors in local schools with high percentages of Alaska Native students, developing more culturally relevant curriculum, and exploring opportunities to put cultural mentors in schools to work with students.

The AITC also plans to explore more explicit collaboration with the Alaska DEED’s ESSA Team, ACTE, SESA, SSG, and TVR to leverage existing partnerships and infrastructures to provide additional supports to tribal programs and rural districts with large populations of Alaska Native students. Specifically, through its relationship with TVR, the AITC will analyze key barriers for Alaska Native students to graduate from high school, what resources and systems are already in place, and what additional resources are needed.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

A hallmark of Alaska’s SSIP is the Theory of Action demonstrating Alaska’s commitment to its stakeholders to advise LEAs on evidence-based strategies for improvement.

The AITC provided training and access to evidence-based practices for:
1. developing compliant IEPs, transition planning, transition assessments, and accessing community and agency resources;
2. implementing curricula for job and independent skills in high school and opportunities for work experience;
3. engaging parents in local communities across the state;
4. authentically engaging stakeholders; and
5. incorporating culturally relevant programming to target outcomes for Alaska Native students.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The AITC provides educators training on evidence-based practices related to developing compliant IEPs, transition planning, conducting transition assessments, accessing community and agency resources, and teaching and developing skills for secondary transition that also ensure cultural relevancy for Alaska Natives. This includes the incorporation of self- determination and self-advocacy principals to become active participants in their IEP meetings. Most recently, Alaska DEED incorporated three new evidence-based practices as part of its statewide training: Transition Assessment, Transition Planning Process, and Transition Assessment Toolkit (https://transitionta.org/advanced-search/?search=assessment). These trainings improve student support and relevancy for students to achieve higher graduation rates.

The AITC provides opportunities for schools across the state to utilize evidence-based curricula for job and independent skills in high school and opportunities for work experience through Pathways, JOBZ Club, S’Cool Store, ATOP Transition Camps, and work experiences.

Family to Family Support is an evidence-based practice used for engaging parents. Family to Family Support is used to assist families by matching them with a unique source of expertise: other families who have children with similar needs, concerns, and challenges. Engaging parents in local communities is a key lever to support the successful matriculation of students from high school to promote customized employment opportunities based on unique context and access.

Alaska DEED is committed to authentically engaging stakeholders to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities. Alaska DEED staff continue to refine engagement strategies from the Leading by Convening framework to best meet the needs of all stakeholders involved in this important work to maximize collaboration and improve efforts.

Increasing graduation rates and post school outcomes for Alaska Native students across the state, and specifically in rural areas, is a priority across all of the Departments within Alaska DEED and AITC stakeholders. Through access to culturally responsive resources and materials, stakeholders aim to improve the quality of life, connection to local community, and increase work related skills for teens and young adults with disabilities who live in Alaska. Providing tools and resources to incorporate traditional values and knowledge into IEPs and Transition Plans will develop multiple types of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors important to life success.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

All evidence-based practices, activities and strategies are directly aligned with strategic priorities as included within the theory of action. These priorities were identified in support of attaining long-term outcomes specifically, increasing capacity of Alaska DEED staff to support schools, building and strengthening relationships between schools and communities, training school leaders to implement strategies with fidelity, and ensuring students receive appropriate instruction and interventions. As explained in the theory of action key levers to meet targets include the implementation of evidence-based strategies to improve state infrastructure, school capacity, student instruction and interventions, and community involvement and integration with the ultimate goal of increasing graduation rates for students with disabilities.

Providing training on evidence-based practices that ensure the development of compliant IEPs, implementation of transition planning and transition assessments, and accessing community and agency resources directly supports training school leaders to implement strategies and ensure that students receive appropriate instructions and interventions. Subsequent data analysis helps the department assess if practices are implemented with fidelity.

Similarly, providing access to financial incentives for schools to implement evidence-based curricula for job and independent skills in high school and opportunities for work experience ensures that students receive appropriate instructions and interventions in support of improving graduation rates and post school outcomes.

Incorporating evidence-based culturally relevant programming to target outcomes for Alaska Native students ensures that students receive appropriate and individualized instructions and interventions in support of improving graduation rates and post school outcomes.

Engaging parents in local communities across the state and authentically engaging stakeholders contributes to building and strengthening relationships between schools and communities. Additionally, these activities help to disseminate resources, information and the development of a shared mission and vision.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

While historically, Alaska DEED has concentrated on evaluating the implementation of the school, student, and community-level practices in one target SSIP school district, Alaska DEED has begun to collect data and assess how practice has changed for teachers that participate in its Statewide Secondary Transition Training. Mainly this data is self-reported by educators and collected through the use of surveys following trainings to determine which evidence-based practices are currently in use at the specific district. Due to limited resources available and the significant geographic areas between the schools across the state, Alaska DEED is reviewing graduation rates and secondary transition data each year to explore potential correlations between districts with higher rates of participation in the Statewide Secondary Transition Training with improved graduation rates and compliance with secondary transition requirements.

Alaska collects Indicator 13 monitoring data from each district each year. Districts report on whether or not IEPs included all of the required elements. Alaska DEED monitors fidelity of implementation through a sampling of records during onsite and virtual monitoring and by making findings when there is noncompliance that require correction of noncompliance. The number of files selected for monitoring is based on the size of the district and are representative of the district, based on the school, student age, and disability category. Alaska DEED plans to further reinforce the connection between the SSIP and its monitoring work by requiring districts below a specific level of compliance for Indicator 13 to participate in the online AITC training.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

As included above, Alaska DEED reviews the following additional data to support its decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice:
1. Educator participation and evaluation data of training opportunities;
2. Download data of evidence-based resources for developing compliant IEPs, transition planning, transition assessments
3. Student participation and evaluation data in educational activities; and
4. Parent training data including the number of one-on-one and group events offered.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The AITC plans to continue training on the implementation of evidence-based practices and further refine the Transition Alaska repository for evidence-based practices. The AITC plans to focus on access and distribution through partnerships of AITC members and other stakeholders to ensure that more educators, both special education and general education, are aware of resources and training opportunities. Anticipated outcomes include increasing the use of evidence-based practices statewide and improved implementation and fidelity.

The AITC will also continue engaging parents using Family to Family Support to provide individualized assistance and build deeper community ties, and applying the Leading by Convening framework to authentically engage stakeholders and widen its stakeholder base.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

Alaska DEED's State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska DEED staff, special education stakeholders including parents and students, and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. Alaska DEED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities throughout the year.

Alaska DEED presents the SPP/APR data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Alaska also receives ongoing input on the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through the monthly meetings of the Alaska Interagency Transition Council (AITC). Based on SPP/APR and SSIP data, DEED and its partners select focus areas for additional statewide activities throughout the year.

The complete SPP/APR is reviewed at least annually by the Education Committee of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education, Alaska EED's Special Education Advisory Panel. Alaska EED also presented the data to its district special education directors at annual meetings.

For the FFY 2020 APR, Alaska DEED implemented two new mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR and the SSIP. Alaska DEED administered an online survey to get additional input on the proposed revisions to the SPP/APR and Alaska DEED's targets. Alaska DEED also held multiple webinars, at different times of day, to ensure broader participation from stakeholders beyond the Governor's Council.

Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input are included in relevant indicators.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Alaska relies heavily on and greatly appreciates the role key stakeholders in implementing and evaluating the SSIP. Many of the activities documented in this report were implemented by AITC members as Alaska DEED has had to depend on stakeholders to participate in more significant ways due to budget cuts, accessibility to locations in rural Alaska, and availability to be onsite. Alaska DEED, with DVR, invites stakeholder participation in the AITC based on the perspectives needed for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the SSIP. Membership of the AITC includes representation from two Alaska School Districts and seven state and tribal agencies: Alaska DEED Special Education staff, Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Services, Alaska Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Tribal Vocational Rehabilitation, Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC), and Stone Soup Group (SSG). Additionally, during 2020, ACTE staff were asked to join the AITC to ensure the cross dissemination of materials and training opportunities. Students, especially students with disabilities, involved in Career and Technical Education (CTE) statistically have higher graduation rates, higher participation in postsecondary education, and better post-school employment outcomes. During monthly AITC meetings, members present evaluation data, newly developed resources and upcoming events, share problems of practice and resources, and engage in collective problem solving.

The AITC sends out quarterly newsletters to continually inform stakeholders about the state’s progress in implementing the SSIP. AITC participants evaluate the implementation of the SSIP and all statewide activities intended to assist students with disabilities graduate and effectively transition from high school to post school life.

SSG is Alaska’s designated State and Federal Parent Training and Information Center. Parent Navigators work to build collaborative relationships between families and schools by offering support one-on-one or in group settings. Services are offered throughout the state to both families and professionals within the community. Currently, SSG has 6 Parent Navigators throughout the state and 3 Developmental Disabilities Resource Connection (DDRC) Navigators. Navigators offer individualized support to their respective region since each district, and in some cases, schools and campuses have different policies that are critical for parents to understand to effectively navigate. As a result of COVID-19, SSG has implemented virtual sessions for parents which has increased parent participation statewide as many offices still remain closed.

In addition, Alaska informs a broader stakeholder group about the SSIP. Information is provided to stakeholders through the Alaska Statewide Special Education Conference (ASSEC) presentations. Stakeholders present at the training presented to teachers about resources available in their community as well as the importance of planning for transition. Additionally, meetings are held with the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) to solicit input and feedback on SSIP targets and activities. Stakeholder unable to attend meetings are able to provide input through surveys or through individual meetings.

As described above, all key decision-making regarding the implementation of the SSIP for student, school, and community level activities such as extending timelines occurs with input from the AITC stakeholders.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

All activities have been described above and are dependent on stakeholder engagement from various stakeholders.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

All activities have been described above and are dependent on stakeholder engagement from various stakeholders.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

All barriers have been described above and include barriers related to stakeholder engagement.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

DONALD E ENOCH JR

**Title:**

State Special Education Director

**Email:**

Donald.enoch@alaska.gov

**Phone:**

9074652972

**Submitted on:**

04/26/22 7:43:26 PM

# ED Attachments



1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. 1 Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. 1 Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. 1 Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)