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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 2021 Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (Alaska DEED) state performance plan and annual performance report (SPP/APR) reports on data from the 2021-2022 reporting period. It demonstrates Alaska DEED's and its special education stakeholders' investment in ensuring that Alaska's children with disabilities receive appropriate special education and related services that result 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 the state did not improve. Through this SPP/APR, Alaska DEED is also establishing targets for the next five years for the revised parts of Indicator 3 based on the state's adoption of a new statewide assessment beginning in the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Alaska DEED collects the data for the SPP/APR through various data processes and 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.**

As described to OSEP during its June 2022 visit to Alaska, 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 DEED directly and through multiple contracts, and ongoing coordination with other Alaska DEED divisions. Alaska DEED 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. DEED has revised its procedures to ensure written findings are issued based on any noncompliance identified through the supplemental workbook. 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. Alaska DEED has now resumed all of its onsite monitoring activities following a hybrid approach conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic.  
  
Identification and Correction of Noncompliance   
Alaska DEED notifies districts of findings of noncompliance within three months of its discovery and verification of noncompliance including noncompliance identified through the supplemental workbook. 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 DEED 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 DEED 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 DEED 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 DEED 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 DEED 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 DEED 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. 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information 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. Beginning with 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 continues to use webinars and surveys 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 DEED'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. To revise targets in FFY 2021, Alaska DEED expanded its solicitation to include additional public input through a survey and a series of public input webinars held in January 2023. 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 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, 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 FFY 2020 data 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 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Alaska DEED 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 through the DMS process including the DMS onsite activities conducted in June 2022; 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.  
  
During FFY 2021 Alaska staff were able to travel to conferences and access in-person technical assistance that was useful and relevant to improving the outcomes reported in this APR.   
  
Alaska DEED took many actions as a result of the technical assistance it received to improve its general supervision system and its performance on the SPP/APR indicators. Most relevant over the past year are refinements made to Alaska DEED's general supervision system based on technical assistance provided by OSEP through its DMS activities with Alaska. Alaska DEED anticipates making additional changes upon receipt of its DMS report.  
  
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 data manager continued to participate regularly in the IDC listserv and adjusted data collections and analyses 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. Alaska also focused on the needs of students related to proficiency on statewide assessments during the implementation of a new statewide assessment in Spring 2022. The proficiency data indicate a need to increase the focus on early academics and Alaska is seeking technical assistance on potentially revising its SIMR to align with early literacy and numeracy initiatives that have been prioritized by Alaska DEED.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it 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. The State provided the required information.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 70.71% |
| Data | 53.87% | 58.73% | 56.94% | 60%[[2]](#footnote-3) | 70.71% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 749 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 48 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 13 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 259 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 749 | 1,069 | 70.71% | 70.00% | 70.07% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 except for when they are modified by an individual student’s IEP team as described in the section below. General graduation requirements are established in Alaska code 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) If a district awards units of credit for world language courses, it shall also award units of credit for postsecondary world language courses or world language courses offered by tribes or tribal entities.  
(f) 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.  
(g) In this section, "world languages" means non-English languages including Alaska Native, American Indian, and American Sign Language.

**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)**

YES

**If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.**

Alaska code includes the flexibility to allow an IEP team to substitute alternative completion requirements for students with disabilities. These alternative requirements, if they are agreed upon by an individual student's IEP team, result in a student receiving a regular diploma. Alaska does not have an alternate diploma.  
  
Section 4 AAC 06.078 - Alternative completion requirements; students with disabilities  
(a) If the disability of a student precludes the taking of regular curricular offerings, a substitute course in the same subject area may be designed and provided as determined by the team that develops the individualized education program (IEP) set out in 4 AAC 52.140. A substitute course may be noted on the student transcript by a number code known only to the IEP team and institution offering the course. A student taking a substitute course must take the state standards-based test described in 4 AAC 06.737.  
(b) If the disability of a student is so severe that substitute course offerings cannot be designed and provided, the student may be awarded a certificate of completion or attendance, based upon completion of the IEP goals or attendance for at least four years of high school.  
(c) In this section,  
(1) "disability" means a condition described in the definition of "children with disabilities" at 4 AAC 52.990;  
(2) "substitute course" means a course that 1st aligned to the grade level content standards in 4 AAC 04.140(a) and meets the state and district graduation requirements as specified in 4 AAC 06.075.

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 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

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.

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

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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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.

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.

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.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 5.20% | 5.00% | 5.20% | 5.00% | 23.54% |
| Data | 6.10% | 5.23% | 5.16% | 4.90% | 23.54% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 749 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 48 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 13 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 259 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 259 | 1,069 | 23.54% | 23.50% | 24.23% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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

## 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** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska's special education stakeholders agreed that there was no need to revise the targets for Indicator 3A based on the implementation of the new statewide assessment and agreed to set the targets for this indicator at 95% based on OSEP's direction.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 1,528 | 1,405 | 1,342 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 231 | 171 | 169 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,035 | 869 | 792 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 54 | 64 | 57 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 1,528 | 1,405 | 1,342 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 233 | 174 | 155 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,029 | 873 | 785 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 54 | 64 | 57 |

\*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 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,320 | 1,528 | 73.07% | 95.00% | 86.39% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,104 | 1,405 | 63.81% | 95.00% | 78.58% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1,018 | 1,342 | 61.37% | 95.00% | 75.86% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,316 | 1,528 | 72.95% | 95.00% | 86.13% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,111 | 1,405 | 63.31% | 95.00% | 79.07% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 997 | 1,342 | 60.37% | 95.00% | 74.29% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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):   
\* Scroll down to "Assessment Results by Year"  
\* Select a year   
\* For the regular statewide assessment: - Under AK STAR ELA and Math Assessments, select Statewide, Districtwide or Schoolwide results - Select a District or School, if needed - For each assessment, click on the "View" link in the far right column labeled "Groups". This will produce a report that breaks out assessment data by specific group and includes the number and percentage 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

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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Alaska revised its targets to be 95% participation for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR as required by the measurement table.

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.   
  
The State reported under Indicator 3B that it implemented a new statewide assessment in 2021-22 school year. Further, the State reported, "Due to the implementation of the new assessment, Alaska DEED worked with its stakeholders to establish new baseline data..." However, OSEP notes that the State did not revise its baseline under Indicator 3A. OSEP is unclear why the change in the State's assessment did not result in a revision to its baseline data for this indicator.

## 3A - Required Actions

# 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 | 2021 | 6.40% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 6.25% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 6.87% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 6.02% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 1.53% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 4.26% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 6.40% | 6.40% | 6.90% | 7.40% | 7.90% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 6.30% | 6.30% | 6.80% | 7.30% | 7.80% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 6.90% | 6.90% | 7.40% | 7.90% | 8.40% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.50% | 7.00% | 7.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 1.50% | 1.50% | 2.00% | 4.00% | 5.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.80% | 5.30% | 5.80% |

**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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

In the 2021-22 school year, Alaska implemented a new statewide assessment. Alaska's Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) has partnered with NWEA to implement a creative approach to balanced statewide assessment that better reflects learning throughout the school year and helps educators target instruction to students’ individual needs. The Alaska System of Academic Readiness (AK STAR) is designed to streamline the testing experience for grades 3–9 in the areas of English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. This balanced approach connects fall and winter MAP Growth interim assessments and the Alaska spring summative assessment to provide a comprehensive assessment system that improves efficiency and cohesion and drives student outcomes by prioritizing teaching and learning. A robust and customized approach to professional learning accompanies the new assessment system, expanding Alaska educators’ assessment literacy and knowledge of strategies for data-informed decision-making and formative instructional practices.   
  
More information about AK STAR can be found on the Alaska DEED website at https://education.alaska.gov/assessments/akstar.  
  
Due to the implementation of the new assessment, Alaska DEED worked with its stakeholders to establish new baseline data and targets for Indicator 3B. Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including slower improvement initially as the state adjusts to the new assessment and then steady progress over the remaining years of the SPP/APR. Some stakeholders, not including parents, expressed a desire to increase the rigor of the targets. Alaska DEED has agreed to revisit the targets for this indicator after it has another year's data for the AK STAR assessments.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 1,266 | 1,040 | 961 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 36 | 32 | 21 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 45 | 33 | 45 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 1,262 | 1,047 | 940 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 37 | 6 | 14 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 39 | 10 | 26 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 81 | 1,266 | 12.30% | 6.40% | 6.40% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 65 | 1,040 | 9.55% | 6.30% | 6.25% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 66 | 961 | 10.03% | 6.90% | 6.87% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 76 | 1,262 | 13.13% | 6.00% | 6.02% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 16 | 1,047 | 5.00% | 1.50% | 1.53% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 40 | 940 | 6.07% | 4.30% | 4.26% | 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):   
\* Scroll down to "Assessment Results by Year"  
\* Select a year   
\* For the regular statewide assessment: - Under AK STAR ELA and Math Assessments, select Statewide, Districtwide or Schoolwide results - Select a District or School, if needed - For each assessment, click on the "View" link in the far right column labeled "Groups". This will produce a report that breaks out assessment data by specific group and includes the number and percentage 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 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State revised its FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 targets 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 | x[[3]](#footnote-4) |
| 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 | x3 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 24.59% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 2.94% | 2.90% | 2.90% | 3.90% | 4.90% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 16.98% | 17.00% | 17.00% | 18.00% | 19.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 18.03% | 18.00% | 18.00% | 19.00% | 19.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 14.71% | 14.70% | 14.70% | 15.70% | 16.70% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 5.66% | 5.70% | 5.70% | 6.70% | 7.70% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska DEED and its special education stakeholders did not make changes to the baseline or targets for Indicator 3C because the alternate assessment did not change, only the regular statewide assessment.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 54 | 64 | 57 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | x[[4]](#footnote-5) | 9 | 11 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 54 | 64 | 57 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 9 | x4 | 10 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x4 | 54 | x4 | 2.94% | x4 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 9 | 64 | 16.98% | 16.98% | 14.06% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 11 | 57 | 18.03% | 18.03% | 19.30% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The change in these data is the result of one fewer student being determined as proficient on the alternate assessment. The state of Alaska is investing significantly in early literacy with multiple initiatives being implemented that special education stakeholders believe will increase proficiency for younger students.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

Like for Group A, Alaska's data for this indicator represent a very small number of students, with the slippage representing approximately one student fewer being proficient. The state of Alaska is investing significantly in early literacy with multiple initiatives being implemented that special education stakeholders believe will increase proficiency for younger students. Alaska expects to see increases in grades 8 and 9 as those initiatives better prepare students for secondary school.

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 9 | 54 | 14.71% | 14.71% | 16.67% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x[[5]](#footnote-6) | 64 | x5 | 5.66% | x5 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 10 | 57 | 24.59% | 24.59% | 17.54% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

Alaska DEED and its special education stakeholders are concerned about the low percentage in Grade 8 compared to Grade 9 (HS) for two consecutive years and the slippage for Group B. While the slippage represents only one or two students, Alaska DEED will continue to explore reasons for slippage.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

While there was the greatest amount of slippage for Group C (HS), Alaska DEED sees that these data are more aligned with proficiency data in other grades as well as across content areas. Alaska will continue to watch these data to determine whether the 24.59% proficiency data in FFY 2021 were an anomaly and whether stakeholders should consider revising the targets for this part of this indicator.

**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):   
\* Scroll down to "Assessment Results by Year"  
\* Select a year   
\* For the regular statewide assessment: - Under AK STAR ELA and Math Assessments, select Statewide, Districtwide or Schoolwide results - Select a District or School, if needed - For each assessment, click on the "View" link in the far right column labeled "Groups". This will produce a report that breaks out assessment data by specific group and includes the number and percentage 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

## 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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 | 2021 | 20.12 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 22.90 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 20.82 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 17.65 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 10.86 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 14.28 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 20.10 | 20.10 | 20.10 | 19.10 | 18.10 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 22.90 | 22.90 | 22.90 | 21.90 | 20.90 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 20.80 | 20.80 | 20.80 | 19.80 | 18.80 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 17.70 | 17.70 | 17.70 | 16.70 | 15.70 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 10.90 | 10.90 | 10.90 | 9.90 | 8.90 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 14.30 | 14.30 | 14.30 | 13.30 | 12.30 |

**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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

In the 2021-22 school year, Alaska implemented a new statewide assessment. More information about AK STAR can be found on the Alaska DEED website at https://education.alaska.gov/assessments/akstar.  
  
Due to the implementation of the new assessment, Alaska DEED worked with its stakeholders to establish new baseline data and targets for Indicator 3D. Stakeholders agreed to the proposed targets including slower improvement initially as the state adjusts to the new assessment and then steady progress over the remaining years of the SPP/APR. As additional data are available from the AK STAR assessment, Alaska DEED will share those data with its stakeholders, including parents, to discuss whether additional revisions to the targets are needed.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 8,128 | 7,561 | 7,050 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,266 | 1,040 | 961 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 2,058 | 2,105 | 1,862 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 97 | 99 | 90 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 36 | 32 | 21 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 45 | 33 | 45 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 8,122 | 7,579 | 6,980 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 1,262 | 1,047 | 940 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,828 | 902 | 1,233 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 95 | 37 | 61 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 37 | 6 | 14 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 39 | 10 | 26 |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6.40% | 26.51% | 24.82 | 20.10 | 20.12 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 6.25% | 29.15% | 29.47 | 22.90 | 22.90 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 6.87% | 27.69% | 26.20 | 20.80 | 20.82 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6.02% | 23.68% | 23.46 | 17.70 | 17.65 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1.53% | 12.39% | 21.02 | 10.90 | 10.86 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 4.26% | 18.54% | 24.63 | 14.30 | 14.28 | N/A | N/A |

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

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State revised its targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 14.29% |
| Data | 0.00% | 7.84% | 10.00% | 5.66% | 14.29% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**FFY 2021 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.**

53

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 1 | 14.29% | 3.00% | 0.00% | 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 statewide rate when looking at the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State.   
  
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 among LEAs in the State.   
  
For Indicator 4A, Alaska, with its stakeholders, established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 students with IEPs enrolled in in the school district and a minimum cell size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.  
  
During the 20-21 school year, only 9 of 54 Alaska districts suspended or expelled any student with an IEP for greater than 10 days and only 1 suspended or expelled 3 students with an IEP for greater than 10 days.

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

Alaska compares each LEA's rate to the statewide rate. The state’s suspension and expulsion rate for the 20-21 school year for children with IEPs was 0.08%, representing a significant decrease from statewide rates of 0.6% in 19-20 and 0.9% in 18-19. These rates area also lower than statewide rates from previous years when the state defined and reviewed its definition of significant discrepancy (e.g., 1.4% in 15-16).  
  
As suspensions and expulsions decreased due to school closures, the number of districts excluded from the calculation increased significantly, to the point of only one district being included in the calculation for FY 2021 (20-21 school year). During the 20-21 school year, many Alaska schools met virtually or in a hybrid format that included virtual learning. The number of suspensions and expulsions was low for all students including students with an IEP.  
  
Alaska DEED will continue to review these data to examine ongoing impacts of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, including with its stakeholders, and if needed will revise its methodology. If data do not increase to pre-pandemic levels, stakeholders will consider changing the definition of significant discrepancy, minimum "n" and cell size, but it agreed it is too soon to do that based on 20-21 data.  
  
While Alaska does not compare rates to the rates for students without an IEP, all other students, the data are used and provided to stakeholders as context. The statewide rate for all other students was 0.06% in 20-21, 0.3% in 19-20, and 0.4% in 18-19, mirroring the recent decreases seen in the data for students with an IEP.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.**

There were no districts identified with a significant discrepancy. If a district had been identified, Alaska DEED would have 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 would be conducted as a part of the cyclical monitoring or through additional file reviews. The monitoring can include reviewing policies, procedures and practices related to IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Alaska DEED staff review files for all students with IEPs that were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. If noncompliance is identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, Alaska EED requires 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.

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 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State’s LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the State reported, "The state’s suspension and expulsion rate for the 20-21 school year for children with IEPs was 0.08%, representing a significant decrease from statewide rates of 0.6% in 19-20 and 0.9% in 18-19. These rates area also lower than statewide rates from previous years when the state defined and reviewed its definition of significant discrepancy (e.g., 1.4% in 15-16). As suspensions and expulsions decreased due to school closures, the number of districts excluded from the calculation increased significantly, to the point of only one district being included in the calculation for FY 2021 (20-21 school year). During the 20-21 school year, many Alaska schools met virtually or in a hybrid format that included virtual learning. The number of suspensions and expulsions was low for all students including students with an IEP. Alaska DEED will continue to review these data to examine ongoing impacts of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, including with its stakeholders, and if needed will revise its methodology." OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State’s chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.  
  
The State’s chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States.

## 4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

# 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 1.96% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 for all children with IEPs when looking at each district’s rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each race and ethnicity category.   
  
For Indicator 4B, Alaska established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 students with IEPs enrolled in in the school district and a minimum cell size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for more than 10 days. For each district that meets the minimum “n” size for all students with an IEP, the comparison is conducted for each race and ethnicity that meets the minimum cell size.  
  
During the 20-21 school year, only 9 of 54 Alaska districts suspended or expelled any student with an IEP for greater than 10 days and only 1 suspended or expelled 3 students with an IEP for greater than 10 days. That district only met the cell size for one race and ethnicity and did not have a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

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

Alaska compares each LEA’s rate for the race and ethnicity categories that meet the cell size to the statewide rate for all children with IEPs. The state’s suspension and expulsion rate for the 20-21 school year for children with IEPs was 0.08%, representing a significant decrease from statewide rates of 0.6% in 19-20 and 0.9% in 18-19. These rates area also lower than statewide rates from previous years (e.g., 1.4% in 15-16).  
  
As suspensions and expulsions decreased due to school closures, the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation increased significantly, to the point of only one LEA being included in the calculation for FY 2021 (20-21 school year). During the 20-21 school year, many Alaska schools met virtually or in a hybrid format that included virtual learning. The number of suspensions and expulsions was low for all students including students with an IEP.   
  
Alaska DEED will continue to review these data to examine ongoing impacts of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, including with its stakeholders, and if needed will revise its methodology. If data do not increase to pre-pandemic levels, stakeholders will consider changing the definition of significant discrepancy, minimum "n" and cell size, but it agreed it is too soon to do that based on 20-21 data.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.**

Alaska DEED did not identify any districts as having a significant discrepancy based on the examination of 2020-2021 data. If it had, Alaska DEED would have 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 could be conducted both as a part of onsite cyclical monitoring and through offsite monitoring and review of student files. The monitoring includes reviewing policies, procedures and practices related to IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Alaska DEED staff review 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 DEED 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.

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 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State’s LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the State reported, "As suspensions and expulsions decreased due to school closures, the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation increased significantly, to the point of only one LEA being included in the calculation for FY 2021 (20-21 school year). During the 20-21 school year, many Alaska schools met virtually or in a hybrid format that included virtual learning." OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State’s chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.  
  
Additionally, the State’s chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States.

## 4B- Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology; and how the State’s threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

# 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 59.50% | 60.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 66.80% |
| A | 66.80% | Data | 63.71% | 64.15% | 65.01% | 64.18% | 66.80% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 12.00% | 11.50% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 10.29% |
| B | 10.29% | Data | 9.05% | 9.17% | 8.90% | 10.47% | 10.29% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.45% | 1.85% | 2.30% |
| C | 2.30% | Data | 2.85% | 2.57% | 2.45% | 2.49% | 2.30% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 67.00% | 67.40% | 67.80% | 68.20% | 68.60% |
| Target B <= | 10.30% | 10.20% | 10.10% | 10.00% | 9.90% |
| Target C <= | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 17,933 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 12,253 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,939 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 307 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 42 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 30 |

**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 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 12,253 | 17,933 | 66.80% | 67.00% | 68.33% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,939 | 17,933 | 10.29% | 10.30% | 10.81% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 379 | 17,933 | 2.30% | 2.30% | 2.11% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **A** | Target >= | 27.50% | 28.00% | 28.00% | 28.00% | 17.87% |
| **A** | Data | 22.78% | 23.91% | 22.81% | 25.42% | 17.87% |
| **B** | Target <= | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 38.00% | 54.50% |
| **B** | Data | 49.44% | 49.79% | 49.78% | 49.88% | 54.53% |

**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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

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

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 365 | 579 | 89 | 1,033 |
| 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 | 38 | 81 | 16 | 135 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 252 | 364 | 53 | 669 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 8 | 11 | 3 | 22 |

**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 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 135 | 1,033 | 17.87% | 17.90% | 13.07% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 672 | 1,033 | 54.53% | 54.40% | 65.05% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Home | 22 | 1,033 | 1.69% | 1.70% | 2.13% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

Alaska does not have universal preschool programs and especially in rural areas, there are not many options for regular early childhood programs that have 50% or more children without disabilities. Alaska DEED continues to provide guidance and technical assistance on the importance of children receiving services in regular early childhood education programs.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

Alaska does not have universal preschool programs and especially in rural areas, there are not many options for regular early childhood programs that have 50% or more children without disabilities. Alaska DEED continues to provide guidance and technical assistance on the importance of children receiving services in regular early childhood education programs.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

Alaska does not have universal preschool programs and especially in rural areas, there are not many options for regular early childhood programs that have 50% or more children without disabilities. Alaska DEED continues to provide guidance and technical assistance on the importance of children receiving services in regular early childhood education programs.

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 74.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% | 75.50% | 84.26% |
| A1 | 71.60% | Data | 79.90% | 85.10% | 87.00% | 85.61% | 84.26% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 48.00% | 49.00% | 44.00% | 62.00% | 37.70% |
| A2 | 61.90% | Data | 45.03% | 45.88% | 44.84% | 44.37% | 37.71% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 76.80% | 77.00% | 77.30% | 77.30% | 85.78% |
| B1 | 77.20% | Data | 86.10% | 84.80% | 88.21% | 90.52% | 85.78% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 46.00% | 46.50% | 46.50% | 63.90% | 37.85% |
| B2 | 63.80% | Data | 44.69% | 45.65% | 46.56% | 40.35% | 37.85% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 74.60% | 75.00% | 75.20% | 75.20% | 86.20% |
| C1 | 75.10% | Data | 80.67% | 83.18% | 84.59% | 88.05% | 86.21% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 50.00% | 52.00% | 49.00% | 68.80% | 44.35% |
| C2 | 68.70% | Data | 51.71% | 50.57% | 49.89% | 49.46% | 44.35% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 84.50% | 84.70% | 84.90% | 85.10% | 85.30% |
| Target A2 >= | 39.70% | 41.70% | 43.70% | 35.70% | 62.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 86.00% | 86.20% | 86.40% | 86.60% | 86.80% |
| Target B2 >= | 39.90% | 41.90% | 43.90% | 45.90% | 64.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 86.20% | 86.40% | 86.60% | 86.80% | 87.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

652

**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 | 23 | 3.53% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 65 | 9.97% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 305 | 46.78% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 203 | 31.13% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 56 | 8.59% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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)* | 508 | 596 | 84.26% | 84.50% | 85.23% | 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)* | 259 | 652 | 37.71% | 39.70% | 39.72% | 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 | 15 | 2.30% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 63 | 9.66% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 298 | 45.71% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 232 | 35.58% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 44 | 6.75% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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)* | 530 | 608 | 85.78% | 86.00% | 87.17% | 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)* | 276 | 652 | 37.85% | 39.90% | 42.33% | 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 | 17 | 2.61% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 63 | 9.66% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 271 | 41.56% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 240 | 36.81% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 61 | 9.36% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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)* | 511 | 591 | 86.21% | 86.20% | 86.46% | 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)* | 301 | 652 | 44.35% | 46.40% | 46.17% | Did not meet 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 by each district to Alaska DEED 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

## 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

Alaska DEED worked with stakeholders to analyze data for this indicator and identify priorities for future analysis. Stakeholders chose to focus on disability category as well as race and ethnicity when examining data for representativeness and response bias. Alaska DEED will also continue to look at gender.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 51.00% | 51.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 56.48% |
| Data | 62.96% | 60.81% | 62.69% | 67.85% | 56.48% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,101 | | 1,987 | 56.48% | 57.50% | 55.41% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Indicator 8 data was collected through a pen-and-paper survey of the parents of 19,503 students who had IEPs during the 2021-2022 school year. The initial announcement flyer and the survey was mailed the first time in April of 2022. Returned surveys were processed through the Spring and the survey was sent a second time to non-responders in July of 2022.   
  
Alaska DEED and its special education stakeholders believe that there may be some residual effect from school closures due to COVID-19 in this indicator. While Alaska DEED, districts, and the Stone Soup Group (Alaska's OSEP-funded parent training & information center or PTI) have provided additional guidance and supports to districts and parents in helping IEP teams navigate decisions related to compensatory services, it has been a steep learning curve for all participants. The lower numbers the past two years reflect some of those challenges and Alaska DEED hopes to see progress in future years.

**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 the same 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.**

19,503

**Percentage of respondent parents**

10.19%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate | 9.72% | 10.19% |

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

This is 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.   
  
Alaska DEED will continue to 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 districts 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 potentially 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.**

The Indicator 8 survey items were developed to be analyzed within the Rasch measurement framework. For our purposes, the Rasch analysis provides two important outputs. The first is a single, scaled score for the entire instrument that can be used for comparisons across states and over time. The second output are a number of internal reliability statistics for the overall instrument and individual items to give the analyst a sense of the quality of the data and how much confidence can be placed in the results.  
  
Nonresponse bias was not identified based on the analyses conducted. For underrepresented groups (Alaska Natives and parents of students with specific learning disabilities), weighting their responses does not change the final results with statistical significance.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding 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.**

Alaska DEED examined he extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services for the following demographics: (1) race and ethnicity, (2) Sex, and (3) Disability Category. These areas of examination were approved by the special education stakeholders.  
  
Survey data appeared to be representative of the Target Population for most areas. However, for race, Caucasians were over-represented by 9.9% in the results and Alaska Natives were under-represented by 5.1%. All other ethnic and racial subgroups were represented within +/- 3% of the target population.   
  
For sex, the data were representative.  
  
For disability category, parents of students with Specific Learning Disabilities were under-represented by 9.9%, parents of students with Autism were over-represented by 3.7%, and parents of students with Speech or Language Impairments were over-represented by 3.1%.

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

NO

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

Alaska DEED 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.

**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 9.9%\*  
African American -0.4%  
Hispanic -1.1%  
Asian 0.8%  
Native American 0.2%  
Alaska Native -5.0%\*  
Multi-Ethnic -1.3%  
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander -2.4%  
Unknown 0.0%  
  
Male 2.3%  
Female -2.3%  
  
Cognitive Impairment 0.1%  
Speech or Language Impairments 3.1%\*  
Emotional Disturbance -1.0%  
Other Health Impairments 2.8%  
Specific Learning Disabilities -9.9%\*  
Autism 3.7%\*  
Other Disabilities Combined 1.1%  
Unknown 0.2%

| **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

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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.

# 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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.**

4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 0 | 50 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 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); or   
\* 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 two districts identified in FFY 2021 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 2021.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 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 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 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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.**

15

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 19 | 0 | 39 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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); or   
\* 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 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 19 districts. Most of the districts overlapped with the 16 districts identified last year and Alaska DEED anticipates we will continue to identify those districts based on their current student populations.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.21% | 97.45% | 96.85% | 92.76% | 95.20% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,818 | 3,711 | 95.20% | 100% | 97.20% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

107

**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 107 eligibility determinations completed beyond the timeline: 40 were completed within between 91 and 95 calendar days; 25 were completed between 96 and 105 calendar days; 15 were completed between 106 and 115 days; and 27 were completed after more than 115 calendar days. This is an improvement from the previous year when 60% (compared to 25% this year) of evaluations not completed in 90 days went more than 115 calendar days. It is also important to note an increase in evaluations conducted from 2499 in 2020-2021 to 3818 in 2021-2022. This is closer to, but slightly higher than the numbers of evaluations conducted prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.  
  
The following reasons for delay were reported by school districts: 1 evaluator unable to test due to weather; 78 one or more necessary team members was not available; and 28 for other reasons (14 parent or student delays, 10 teacher delays, 28 COVID school closure delays, and 1 unknown reason).

**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 days 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. Alaska DEED considers this a database because it includes data for the entire reporting year but it is not a live database -- Alaska DEED is not able to access live data throughout the year.  
  
Alaska DEED also collects monitoring data related to this indicator through its cyclical onsite monitoring. However, the files reviewed reflect only a small number of Alaska students so Alaska DEED has chosen to submit the full year's data. Any files that are noncompliant from monitoring are also recorded as noncompliant in the supplemental data collection, so the data reported for this indicator reflect accurate data for all students referred for special education.

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

The number of findings identified and verified as corrected reported below reflect findings of noncompliance in 22 districts that were identified by Alaska DEED through its review of data submitted in the supplementary workbook and corrected as described. While Alaska DEED did not issue a written finding of noncompliance to each district with noncompliance identified in the supplemental workbook, it identified noncompliance in each LEA with less than 100% compliance by documenting which LEAs had noncompliance, followed up with each LEA to verify correction as described below, and documented the tracked correction of the noncompliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **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 2020 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 additional district-specific data requests. Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by each LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, and through collection of verification data when the state is onsite conducting 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.  
  
For the 22 districts with less than 100% compliance in the data for all kids referred during the FFY 2020 reporting period, 4 districts were 95% compliant or higher, 7 districts were between 90 and 94% compliant, 8 districts were between 75 and 89% compliant, and 3 were below 75% compliant (all with a denominator of five or fewer).   
  
For 8 districts, Alaska reviewed subsequent data demonstrating 100% compliance during onsite monitoring, finding no additional noncompliance for students referred after the close of the reporting period. For 14 districts, Alaska reviewed additional data from the district that showed 100% compliance for a period of time. All districts were able to show 100% compliance for at least one month prior to December 2022.

**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.  
  
Twenty-two districts were identified as having noncompliance for this indicator based on FFY 2020 data (2020-2021). All of the 22 districts submitted data in the supplemental workbook that provided evidence that each evaluation was completed, although late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

The State reported that "[w] hile Alaska DEED did not issue a written finding of noncompliance to each district with noncompliance identified in the supplemental workbook, it identified noncompliance in each LEA with less than 100% compliance by documenting which LEAs had noncompliance, followed up with each LEA to verify correction as described below, and documented the tracked correction of the noncompliance."  
  
Regarding the State’s identification and correction of findings of noncompliance, OSEP has monitored the State as part of its Differentiated System of Monitoring and Support (DMS) process and will issue a monitoring report separately.

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.70% | 92.63% | 96.02% | 94.44% | 92.24% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 323 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 23 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 284 |
| 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. | 12 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 0 |
| 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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. | 284 | 288 | 92.24% | 100% | 98.61% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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**

4

**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 4 eligibilities determined and IEPs developed beyond the 3rd birthday: 1 was completed between 1 and 10 days after the 3rd birthday; 1 was completed between 11 and 30 days after the 3rd birthday; 1 was completed between 31 and 60 days after the 3rd birthday; and 1 was completed 61 or more days after the 3rd birthday.   
  
Of the 4 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 3 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 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. Alaska DEED considers this a database because it includes data for the entire reporting year but it is not a live database -- Alaska DEED is not able to access live data throughout the year.  
  
Alaska DEED also collects monitoring data related to this indicator through its cyclical onsite monitoring. However, the files reviewed reflect only a small number of Alaska students so Alaska DEED has chosen to submit the full year's data. Any files that are noncompliant from monitoring are also recorded as noncompliant in the supplemental data collection, so the data reported for this indicator reflect accurate data for all students who were served in Part C and referred for Part B eligibility determination.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2020 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 C to B transition timelines) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or additional district-specific data requests. Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by each LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, and through collection of verification data when the state is onsite conducting 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.  
  
For the 3 districts with less than 100% compliance in the data for all kids referred during the FFY 2020 reporting period, 1 districts was 90% compliant or higher and 2 were below 75% compliant (with denominators of 5 and 2).   
  
For 1 of the 3 districts, Alaska reviewed subsequent data demonstrating 100% compliance during onsite monitoring, finding no additional noncompliance for students referred after the close of the reporting period. For 2 districts, Alaska requested and received additional data from the district that showed 100%. All districts were able to show 100% compliance for at least one month prior to December 2022.

**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 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.  
  
Four districts were identified as having noncompliance for this indicator based on FFY 2020 data (2020-2021). Each of the 3 districts submitted data in the supplemental workbook that provided evidence that each eligibility was determined and IEP implemented, although late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

The State reported that "[w]hile Alaska DEED did not issue a written finding of noncompliance to each district with noncompliance identified in the supplemental workbook, it identified noncompliance in each LEA with less than 100% compliance by documenting which LEAs had noncompliance, followed up with each LEA to verify correction as described below, and documented the tracked correction of the noncompliance."  
  
Regarding the State’s identification and correction of findings of noncompliance, OSEP has monitored the State as part of its Differentiated System of Monitoring and Support (DMS) process and will issue a monitoring report separately.

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.95% | 97.91% | 96.93% | 95.05% | 95.90% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,605 | 3,778 | 95.90% | 100% | 95.42% | 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 school districts. Alaska DEED considers this a database because it includes data for the entire reporting year but it is not a live database -- Alaska DEED is not able to access live data throughout the year.  
  
Alaska DEED also collects monitoring data related to this indicator through its cyclical onsite monitoring. However, the files reviewed reflect only a small number of Alaska students so Alaska DEED has chosen to submit the full year's data. Any files that are noncompliant from monitoring are also recorded as noncompliant in the supplemental data collection, so the data reported for this indicator reflect accurate data for all students referred for special education.

| **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)**

The number of findings identified and verified as corrected reported below reflect findings that were identified by Alaska DEED and corrected as described.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2020 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) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or additional district-specific data requests. Alaska DEED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by each LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, and through collection of verification data when the state is onsite conducting 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.  
  
For the 23 districts with less than 100% compliance in the data for all kids referred during the FFY 2020 reporting period, 9 districts were 95% compliant or higher, 5 districts were between 90 and 94% compliant, r districts were between 75 and 89% compliant, and 5 were below 75% compliant (2 with a denominator of five or fewer).   
  
For 3 districts, Alaska reviewed subsequent data demonstrating 100% compliance during onsite monitoring, finding no additional noncompliance for students referred after the close of the reporting period. For 5 districts, Alaska DEED reviewed data demonstrating continued noncompliance during onsite monitoring. Following up to the related monitoring, findings Alaska requested and received additional data from the district that showed 100% compliance. For 15 districts identified with noncompliance, Alaska DEED verified correction through offsite activities. For those 15 districts, Alaska requested and received additional data from the district that showed 100% compliance. All districts were able to show 100% compliance for at least one month prior to December 2022.

**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.  
  
Twenty-three districts were identified as having noncompliance for this indicator based on FFY 2020 data (2020-2021). All of the 23 districts submitted data providing evidence that secondary transition plans were corrected and Alaska DEED reviewed a sample of those files, including through its onsite monitoring.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 13 - OSEP Response

The State reported that "[w]hile Alaska DEED did not issue a written finding of noncompliance to each district with noncompliance identified in the supplemental workbook, it identified noncompliance in each LEA with less than 100% compliance by documenting which LEAs had noncompliance, followed up with each LEA to verify correction as described below, and documented the tracked correction of the noncompliance."  
  
Regarding the State’s identification and correction of findings of noncompliance, OSEP has monitored the State as part of its Differentiated System of Monitoring and Support (DMS) process and will issue a monitoring report separately.

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# 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 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s 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. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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. 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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 14.00% | 14.70% | 13.00% | 16.25% | 8.10% |
| A | 16.20% | Data | 15.00% | 13.41% | 13.17% | 12.91% | 8.15% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 44.00% | 46.00% | 56.00% | 59.25% | 58.80% |
| B | 59.20% | Data | 55.53% | 53.18% | 56.72% | 54.49% | 58.81% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 61.50% | 61.50% | 68.00% | 70.55% | 67.18% |
| C | 70.50% | Data | 66.05% | 66.12% | 68.28% | 62.36% | 67.18% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 9.00% | 10.00% | 11.00% | 12.00% | 16.30% |
| Target B >= | 59.00% | 59.20% | 59.40% | 59.60% | 59.80% |
| Target C >= | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

Stakeholders reviewed the data for this indicator and prioritized further examination around dropout status and disability category in addition to race and ethnicity when looking at representativeness and non-response bias. Alaska DEED will also continue to look at sex and English proficiency status.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 1,119 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 448 |
| Response Rate | 40.04% |
| 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 | 238 |
| 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) | 38 |
| 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). | 3 |

| **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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 37 | 448 | 8.15% | 9.00% | 8.26% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 275 | 448 | 58.81% | 59.00% | 61.38% | 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) | 316 | 448 | 67.18% | 67.50% | 70.54% | 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** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate | 39.58% | 40.04% |

**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 Office of Special Education provided a list of 2020-2021 School Exiters to SESA and Alaska Research and Evaluation Services. The state office of Special Education solicited 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  
  
Indicator 14 data was collected through a telephone survey census of 1,119 former students who had IEPs and left public school during the 2020-2021 school year. Four hundred forty-eight (448) former students completed the survey for a response rate of 40%. Respondents included those who graduated with a regular diploma, those who received a diploma under waiver, those who reached maximum age for school attendance, and those who dropped out.  
  
Alaska DEED 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. We hope to continue the combination of postcard reminders and telephone surveys to continue to achieve high response rates.

**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. The analyses found data to be representative of respondents by ethnicity, disability categories, select demographic characteristics, and sex. Overall, survey data appeared to be representative of the Target Population. All ethnic and racial subgroups, and disability types were proportional within +/- 3% of the target population.  
  
Our analysis found no evidence of response bias.

**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 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.**

Alaska DEED examined he extent to which the demographics of the respondents were representative of the total population for the following demographics: (1) race and ethnicity, (2) Sex, (3) Disability Category, and (4) Exit Status (dropout); and (5) limited English proficiency (LEP). These areas of examination were approved by the special education stakeholders.

**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).**

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.  
  
2022 Response Rate Differentials:  
Caucasian -0.7%  
African American -0.6%  
Hispanic -0.2%  
Asian 0.1%  
Native American 0.3%  
Alaska Native 1.3%  
Multi-Ethnic -0.1%  
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander -0.1%  
Unknown 0.0%  
  
Learning Disabled -2.3%  
Emotionally Disturbed 0.3%  
Intellectual Disability 0.5%  
All Other Disability Categories (low-incidence categories) 1.5%  
  
Female -1.6%  
Minority 0.7%  
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) -0.4%  
Dropouts -2.5%

| **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

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 7 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 4 |

**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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 70.00%-80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% | 70.00%-80.00% |
| Data | 25.00% | 16.67% | 100.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | 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% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2020 Data** | FFY 2021 Target (low) | FFY 2021 Target (high) | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 7 | 100.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 57.14% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

This was in increase in the number of resolution sessions and it is not far below the range. Alaska DEED is not concerned about the slippage at this time.

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

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 1 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information are included in relevant indicators.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| 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% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | 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% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target (low)** | **FFY 2021 Target (high)** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. 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 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 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 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) 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)**

NO

**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.**

The subset of the population for the indicator is all Alaska Native students with disabilities in the state.

**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.**

https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SPED/docs/Alaska-State-Systemic-Improvement%20-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf

**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 | 61.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 62.00% | 64.00% | 66.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| x | 346 | 61.00% | 62.00% | 63.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 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 Department of Education and Early Development (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. For further analysis, the data manager disaggregates data by the following populations: 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 DEED analyzes various data sources to evaluate progress toward the SiMR. Alaska DEED understands that graduation rates improve based on many contributing factors. While there is a correlation between the data points included below and graduation rates that does not establish causation or preclude additional data from impacting graduation results. Data are continually assessed to determine additional data sources or activities that may be contributing to graduation rates across the state and that should be monitored.   
  
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 as a short-term source to assess the potential longer-term impacts of strategic academic interventions, compliant transition plans and participation in Career and Technical Education (CTE). The average attendance of Alaska Native students with disabilities in school year 20-21: 91%; 21-22: 87% (all students with disabilities statewide school year 20-21: 92%; 21-22: 85%). Alaska DEED is looking to see what might have influenced the decrease in attendance rates for both populations.  
In school year 20-21, 15.4% of CTE participants identified as Alaska Native and 11.4% of CTE participants were students with disabilities, as defined by IDEA. In school year 21-22, 16.46% of CTE participants identified as Alaska Native and 13.09% of CTE participants were students with disabilities, as defined by IDEA, an increase in proportion on both counts. Additionally, Indicator 13 data are disaggregated and examined to determine the percentage of youth with an IEP that includes all required components in their transition plan: all students with disabilities: 95.4%; Alaska Native students with disabilities: 93.6%. Compared to FY 21, 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 2021 Statewide Transition Training, 59 educators across 35 school districts and organizations participated. An additional 53 staff registered for the event but were not documented as participants of the live training but were provided links to access materials asynchronously through the Transition Alaska Platform. 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 of 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 maintain its online platform, Transition Alaska, to increase access to information and resources for stakeholders across the state. The platform continues to serve as a key tool used to increase the 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. In FY22, the platform sustained 667 total accounts including 141 adult accounts, 39 student accounts, and 223 unspecified accounts (compared FY21: 264 total accounts; 216 adult accounts; 25 student accounts; 23 unspecified accounts).   
  
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. Student participation continues to vary year to year as a result of pandemic as teachers continue to report that they are overwhelmed. Participation and evaluation data related to the many student-centered activities offered is collected including ATOP Transition Camps (186 students in person, 136 students virtually, 445 students participating in webinars), JOBZ Club (49 total students, 42 Alaska Native), S’Cool Store (30 students, 15 Alaska Native), Pathways (8 students, 8 Alaska Native), and Summer Work (183 students, 102 Alaska Native) were collected.  
  
Evidence demonstrates that the use of culturally responsive curricula increases academic achievement and graduation rates by connecting academic concepts to student experiences and lives, making curricula more meaningful, engaging, and effective. To support the use of culturally responsive curricula for Alaska Native students with disabilities, data are 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 are also collected to inform efforts to provide tools and trainings that facilitated conversations about graduation and secondary transition with parents. Additionally, participation and evaluation data related to trainings made available to support participation in secondary transition planning for parents is tracked.

**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.**

https://education.alaska.gov/tls/SPED/docs/Alaska%20DEED%20State%20Systemic%20Evaluation%20Plan.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)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Access to Trainings and Resources  
Alaska continues to use many vehicles to disseminate and increase access to trainings and resources. Based on participation data and survey results, Alaska leveraged virtual platforms to make trainings and resources more widely accessible to educators across the state through the Transition Alaska platform (https://transitionalaska.org/). This includes the delivery of trainings and opportunities for students. DEED and its partners were also able to reinstate key in-person events to allow for both modes of participation. The ACTE also formally launched its clearing house, the Alaska Education Exchange, to share CTE lesson planning across the state.  
  
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. Throughout the reporting period, Alaska DEED staff continued to utilize the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative’s (NTACT) universal technical assistance to stay up to date on new evidence-based practices. Alaska DEED staff participated in 36 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 2022, the AITC hosted its third annual Statewide Secondary Transition Training). The AITC made improvements to the structure and content of the event to maximize learning. Additionally, as a result of its participation in professional development and training opportunities, Alaska DEED staff continued to integrate and provide trainings on NTACT-developed evidence-based practices. The quarterly transition newsletter continued to inform teachers about trainings and professional development opportunities, information on evidence-based practices, and examples of implementation across Alaska.   
  
The AITC continues to use its newsletter as a vehicle for disseminating information on evidence-based practices and training and professional development opportunities. In 2021-2022, recipients increased from 253 to 261.   
  
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. Alaska Transition Outcome Project (ATOP) Transition Camps were offered both in-person and virtually, totaling 15 offerings.   
  
DVR also facilitated opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in job opportunities through local employers in small businesses. During June-July 2022, 183 students participated. The AITC conducted an analysis of current job opportunities for high school special education students based on employers who participate in summer work. 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. The top industries from 2021 to 2022 remained consistent even though the percent make up varied (2021 - Consumer Goods and Services: 17%; Civic, Social & Youth Organizations: 12%; Health Care/Social Asst, Public/Private: 12%. 2022 - Consumer Goods and Services: 28%, Civic, Social & Youth Organizations: 13%; Health Care/Social Asst, Public/Private: 6%.  
  
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 45 parent trainings statewide. SSG continued to highlight the importance of supporting families and students to improve graduation and post-secondary outcomes. SSG hosted a 6-part transition series, 58 parents attended sessions. Sessions included Employment While Receiving Social Security Benefits, ENABLE- Special Needs Planning, DDRC Medicaid Waivers, and Guardianship and Supported Decision Making Agreements. Additionally, SSG continued to serve as the head of the School Workgroup for the Shared Vision Project, charged with envisioning a system that supports students with disabilities. Currently the workgroup is finalizing a poster design that will be distributed to schools of all levels that encourage students with disabilities to dream about what they want to be when they grow up.   
  
SSG has also engaged in strategic initiatives and resource development to connect with more Alaska Native families and develop relationships. SSG has entered into a partnership with the Southcentral Foundation (SCF) project that works to empower Alaska Native parents and onsite support during medical appointments as well as ongoing follow-up services to ensure that families are connecting to local services in their home communities and receiving appropriate special education services at school. Since the launch of its partnership with the SCF, SSG has served 83 Alaska Native families. Additionally, SSG has translated two videos that focus on IEPs into Yup’ik which is the most common language spoken after English in Western Alaska.   
  
Alaska DEED continued to collect and monitor responses related to six transition questions included in its APR Parent Involvement (Indicator 8) survey (18.4% identified as Alaska Native):  
1) It is important to me that my child receives a high school diploma/graduate from high school. (All: 21-22: 93% of parents agree; AK: 21-22: 90% of parents agree)  
2) My child’s IEP team talks about possible employment or careers after high school. (All: 21-22: 72% of parents agree; AK: 21-22: 72% of parents agree)  
3) My child’s IEP team talks about possible employment training and/or college after high school. (All: 21-22: 70% of parents agree; AK: 21-22: 66% of parents agree  
4) I have talked with my child about possible employment or careers after high school. (All: 21-22: 94% of parents agree; AK: 21-22: 92% of parents agree)  
5) I have talked with my child about possible employment training and/or college after high school. (All: 21-22: 93% of parents agree; AK: 21-22: 91% of parents agree)  
6) I expect that my child will participate in subsistence activities during their adult life. (All: 21-22: 74% of parents agree; AK: 21-22:88% of parents agree)  
  
The data collected will be used to inform future training and resource offerings. Alaska DEED and AITC stakeholders have worked to better understand percent change in parent responses.   
  
Culturally Responsive Programs   
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 through the use of the Transition Alaska platform and statewide trainings.

**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.**

Virtual Access to Trainings and Resources (PD and TA)  
Alaska DEED in collaboration with AITC partners, continue to track and assess the utility and relevance of technological platforms and resources. Transition Alaska tracks the number of accounts for parents, students, and educators and number of resources made available. Currently the website has 511 users. During school year 2021-2022, 141 new adult accounts and 39 new student accounts were created. In addition to the 4 training series that were previously added to the resource hub, an introduction to transition planning webinar was added in addition to the 2022 Secondary Transition Training. In response to interest and requests for additional transition trainings, the AITC will host a yearlong transition training series that will consist of 6 webinars during the 2022-2023 school year. The Transition Alaska website is viewed as an important mechanism for sustaining improvement and scale-up efforts.   
  
Improve Alaska DEED Capacity (PD and TA)  
Alaska DEED staff continued to increase its internal capacity to lead AITC activities and apply learnings from professional development activities. Alaska DEED staff were 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. Activities enable staff to create infrastructure and systems that sustain improvement efforts through the meaningful participation of DEED 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 evidence-based strategies that are responsive to the needs of educators across the state and increase access through its Statewide Secondary Transition Training and Transition Alaska online repository of resources.  
  
Improve School Capacity (PD, TA, and Quality Standards)  
Short-term outcomes included high statewide participation in the AITC’s Statewide Secondary Transition Training across the state. In Fall 2022, the AITC facilitated its 3rd Statewide Secondary Transition Training for 90 educators, across 33 school districts and organizations. Content and format continues to be well received from participants as demonstrated through survey results (2021: 100% reported the quality the trainings as very good or excellent; 2022: 100% reported the quality the trainings as good, very good, or excellent).   
  
The 2022 Alaska Statewide Special Education Conference (ASSEC) was held in person. AITC members facilitated 4 sessions focused on graduation and secondary transition including. AITC members also use the conference to disseminate information about services and resources available through the AITC and their organizations. The Alaska ACTE in conjunction with Alaska CAN! (Alaska’ Postsecondary Access and Completion Network) hosted its conference in May of 2022. The theme of the event was cultural identity and its vital role in postsecondary planning.   
  
Provide Opportunities for Students (Fiscal and Governance)  
AITC partners apply for and use SEA funds to provide opportunities for students to participate in activities 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 implements 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. (28% increase)  
I know where to go to get the training for the job I want. (11% increase)   
I know about educational and/or training opportunities available to me. (18% increase)  
I understand the skills that are needed to get hired. (31% increase)  
I know about how my community can support me in achieving my goals. (18% increase)  
  
Summer Work programs continued to provide students access to work experience (2022: 183 students). Each student who participated was placed in a job with a local employer. In 2022, the number of local individual employers totaled 55 compared to 67 in 2021. DEED took summer work business data to analyze and understand current job offerings available to students with disabilities by industry to understand work opportunities and trends (FY21 and FY22: 19 identified industries).  
  
The ACTE formally launched the Alaska Education Exchange. The platform acts as a repository for content, showcase lessons and content, facilitate collaboration through public and private groups, and has a content algorithm that helps customize user experience. Upon registration, special education teachers are able to select special needs as a subject area/area of focus as well as the grade level they support to receive direct access to customized content. Within its first year, the platform generates 221 users and stores 43,669 resources.   
  
Collaborate to Build Family – School Relationships (Governance, TA and PD)  
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 create sustainable systems for improvement efforts and wider dissemination and support which contribute to achieving the SiMR. Virtual methods for building community connections, family engagement, and conducting parent trainings have scaled up participation across the state which has resulted in increased statewide outreach which historically entailed physically attending a specific event. This has resulted in more staff being able to attend events unrestricted by budget constraints and more parents being able to attend trainings. In response, SSG has been able to develop more targeted trainings regardless of parent geographic location. 58 participants attended its 6-part virtual transition series (80%: parents, guardians or family members; 20%: professionals). Based on survey results, 100% of respondents found the training relevant and 100% said the quality of the information received was good or excellent.   
  
As part of the collaboration efforts, the following data were reported from October 2020 – September 2021. 22 hours: SSG parent navigators accompanied parents (virtually) to IEP or school meetings to provide support; 94 hours: SSG parent navigators provided information and support to families directly related to special education services; 116 families: unique families receiving special education navigation support; and 6 trainings with 110 views: virtual trainings providing special education information.   
  
Culturally Responsive Programs (PD, TA, and Quality Standards)  
The AITC made available four new Alaska Traditional Transition Skills curriculums, developed by the Special Education Service Agency (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 Winter Safety on the Land, Introduction to Dene Athabascan Beading, Our Way of Life, and Indigenous Leadership Skills. These new curriculums focused on Kodiak Region/Alutiiq/Sugpiaq values and Interior Region, Dene Athabascan values.  
  
DVR and TVR worked to address issues of accessibility identified during the last reporting period. Based on TVR’s work with rural districts with high percentages of Alaska Native students, TVR and DVE printed and distributed 600 copies of the Exploring Transition Goals Workbook throughout the state.

**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 8, Alaska DEED plans to strengthen partnerships with ACTE and affiliate groups such as AlaskaCAN 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 2023. AITC stakeholders will continue to present during the ASSEC to circulate evidence-based practices, priorities, and opportunities to educators across the state in February 2023.   
  
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, ATOP Transition Camps, and summer work opportunities statewide to improve attendance rates, graduation rates, and post-secondary outcomes.   
  
Collaboration between the ACTE and AITC will continue to ensure that resources accessible on Transition Alaska are included in the Alaska Education Exchange and more widely available.   
  
Collaborate to Build Family – School Relationships  
Alaska DEED will continue to 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. Alaska DEED staff will continue to 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.   
  
Culturally Responsive Programs   
The AITC will continue to encourage the use of virtual platforms to ensure the equitable access of training and resources. One initial step is a collaboration between TVR and DVR to conduct a national webinar on available resources to highlight resources and strategies identified as high leverage practices for Alaska Native students with disabilities.   
To better understand the CTE needs of Alaska Native Students, AlaskaCAN has pursued a number of initiatives to bring stakeholders together to inform future work on culturally affirming CTE programming. Alaska CAN hosted a workshop, Now for Next, that focused on exploring what we can do now to help Alaskan students prepare for what’s next and turn the curve on Alaska’s postsecondary outcomes from last to best. As a result of the November 2022 meeting, the group is working to prepare a report on priorities and next steps. Additionally, Alaska is working with the Southeast Region of Alaska (18 school districts) on a Supporting Transitions and Educational Promise in Southeast Alaska (STEPS AK) grant to participate in conversations focused on the ways we can meet the 65 by 25 goal. Culturally Responsive CTE is an additional topic of discussion to think through how employment skills that tie into culture could bring local support and sustainability to programs. This work will help to shape programming priorities made available on the Alaska Education Exchange.

**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 other professional development on evidence-based practices including:  
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 enable students to become active participants in their IEP meetings. Currently, the AITC makes training on and resources for implementing 8 NTACT-developed evidence-based tools available to school staff (Transition Gradebook, Core Data Tools for Dropout Prevention, Literature Map of Dropout Prevention Interventions for Students with Disabilities, Risk Calculator Tool to Assess & Address Dropout, Pre-Employment Transition Services checklist, Identifying Secondary Transition Assessments, State Toolkit for Examining Post-School Success, Secondary Transition Evaluation Toolkit). These trainings and resources 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 (Short-term projects that bridge the gap between Special Education and Career and Technical Education (CTE)), JOBZ Club (After school activity that introduces students to Work Readiness Skills (Soft Skills). Club’s 7 includes modules to help students gain the soft skills of Communication, Teamwork, Problem Solving, Attitude, and Professionalism), S’Cool Store (Includes five modules to introduce students to small business concepts as they work through setting a goal, developing a business plan, and putting the plan into action where students create a “Pop Up” business), ATOP Transition Camps (focused exploration that allows students in grades 8 to 12, the opportunity to explore options for life after high school), and summer work experiences (provides hands on work experiences at local businesses, constituting two four-week programs).   
  
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. Through the use of virtual services, SSG has been able to increase its outreach efforts. An additional impact of virtual trainings includes an increase in professionals attending events.   
  
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. The AITC made available 4 new curricula on Alaska Traditional Transition Skills, totaling 9 culturally affirming curriculums and plans to continue to make resources available in the future.

**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.   
  
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 promotes the exploration and use of 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 further reinforces the connection between the SSIP and its monitoring work by requesting districts below a specific level of compliance for Indicator 13 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, and 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.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

Alaska DEED is still working to understand the impacts of the pandemic on graduation rates for students with disabilities and more specifically Alaska Native students with disabilities. Improving graduation rates continues to be an area of focus for both Alaska DEED, AITC members. and stakeholders. Based on stakeholder meetings, it was recommended to implement SSIP activities without change.

**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.  
  
Indicator-specific details about the stakeholder input to revise targets and other information 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), Alaska Career and Technical Education (ACTE) and Stone Soup Group (SSG). 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 7 Parent Navigators throughout the state and 5 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. Given virtual platforms, they are also able to serve a wider range of parents across the states by opening up trainings outside of their respective region.  
  
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 use the opportunity to present 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. Stakeholders 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

**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

## 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 ENOCH

**Title:**

State Special Education Administrator

**Email:**

donald.enoch@alaska.gov

**Phone:**

9074652972

**Submitted on:**

04/25/23 2:14:02 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**Alaska**

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[6]](#footnote-7)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 70.83% | Needs Assistance |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 24 | 10 | 41.67% |
| **Compliance** | 18 | 18 | 100.00% |

**2023 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

| **Reading Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 83% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 74% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 17% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 96% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 32% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 97% | 1 |

**Math Assessment Elements**

| **Math Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 83% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 75% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 33% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 95% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 27% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 93% | 1 |

**Exiting Data Elements**

| **Exiting Data Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out** | 24 | 0 |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma\*\*** | 69 | 0 |

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

**2023 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator[[7]](#footnote-8)** | **Performance (%)** | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** | 97.20% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** | 98.61% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** | 95.42% | YES | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

## Data Rubric

**Alaska**

FFY 2021 APR[[8]](#footnote-9)

|  | **Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3A** | 1 | 1 |
| **3B** | 1 | 1 |
| **3C** | 1 | 1 |
| **3D** | 1 | 1 |
| **4A** | 1 | 1 |
| **4B** | 1 | 1 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | 1 | 1 |
| **10** | 1 | 1 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
| **12** | 1 | 1 |
| **13** | 1 | 1 |
| **14** | 1 | 1 |
| **15** | 1 | 1 |
| **16** | 1 | 1 |
| **17** | 1 | 1 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 21 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
|  | **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 26 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[9]](#footnote-10)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/**  **Ed Envs**  **Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 21 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 26.00 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 26 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 26.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 52.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 52.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator\*) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part B 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part B Personnel | C070, C099, C112 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Discipline | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | Wednesday in the 3rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date) |
| Part B Dispute Resolution | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in May |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

## Dispute Resolution



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

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. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B." [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)