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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**

Alaska's annual performance report (APR) was presented to stakeholders on January 21, 2021, for review and input. Alaska's stakeholders are invested in ensuring that the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (Alaska EED) provides a free and appropriate public education to Alaska's children with disabilities and that Alaska EED meets the requirements of IDEA including reporting timely and accurate data in the APR.

OSEP's determinations for Alaska in 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. OSEP's June 2020 letter informed Alaska that it must report 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.

Alaska accessed technical assistance from: OSEP, by participating in OSEP's monthly technical assistance calls and receiving individualized technical assistance from multiple OSEP state leads; the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT); the National Center on Systemic Improvement (NCSI); and IDEA Data Center (IDC) by receiving individualized TA from NTACT, NCSI and IDC TA providers.

Alaska EED took many actions as a result of that technical assistance that will help to increase results for children with disabilities through systemic change. Alaska continued refining its data collection instructions and processes. Alaska continued to develop interagency relationships related to secondary transition and continued communication mechanisms through NTACT work, increasing capacity of new EED staff on the secondary transition requirements. As a result of TA received from OSEP and NCSI, Alaska refined the improvement efforts in its SSIP to be more feasible and measurable and is revisiting the goals of the SSIP with stakeholders.

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

Alaska EED collects data for the SPP/APR from its data systems and districts as data are available after the end of the reporting period. Alaska EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. Alaska EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska's parent training and information and community parent resource centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and Alaska school district administrators and staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families.

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

54

**General Supervision System**

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

Alaska EED has a multi-faceted general supervision system that includes its compliance monitoring system, mechanisms for monitoring improvement, dispute resolution system (including mediation, complaints, and due process), annual reporting of district level data, administration of Part B and Alaska funds through the grants management system, distribution of revisions to the Guidance for Special Education Personnel document (policies and procedures for special education administration in Alaska), technical assistance provided by Alaska EED directly and through multiple contracts, and ongoing coordination with other EED divisions. Alaska incorporates its technical assistance and professional development systems into its general supervision systems. Needs identified through the general supervision system are addressed through technical assistance and professional development.

Compliance Monitoring: Identification and Correction of Noncompliance

Every district in Alaska is monitored each year through the supplemental workbook data collection that collects data to determine LEA compliance with regulatory requirements of IDEA, including with the APR indicators. In addition, EED conducts cyclical onsite compliance monitoring in 10-15 districts annually. Large districts receive onsite monitoring each year. Additional monitoring occurs whenever a need is identified. Through these mechanisms, Alaska monitors compliance with not only the SPP/APR indicators, but other related IDEA requirements and Alaska state requirements. For the 2019-20 school year, monitoring was complete prior to school closures due to COVID-19. Since the closures, Alaska EED has worked to establish procedures for virtual monitoring.

Identification and Correction of Noncompliance

Alaska notifies districts of findings of noncompliance within three months following its discovery of noncompliance. 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. If noncompliance is not verified as corrected within one year of identification or if districts do not comply with corrective actions, Alaska imposes 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.

The State of Alaska 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 DEE 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 verifies that each required action, although late, occurred.

Mechanisms for Monitoring Improvement

In addition to compliance monitoring, Alaska EED 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 EED related to monitoring cycles, technical assistance and professional development.

Alaska EED special education staff strive to work collaboratively with their colleagues who are focused on improvement for all students including through Alaska's ESSA plan and accountability system. Schools are required to create a school improvement plan that addresses any subgroup, including students with disabilities, that does not meet state targets for performance.

Alaska EED also reviews performance data to identify districts with high performance in performance areas including disproportionality and graduation rates for students with disabilities. EED investigates high performing districts to determine whether practices responsible for improvement can be replicated in other districts and uses districts who demonstrate improvement as stakeholders to improve.

Dispute Resolution System

Mediation - Alaska EED provides mediation services to parents of students with disabilities and/or school districts in Alaska free of change. 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 an accepted complaint, 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.

Annual Reporting of District Level Data

Alaska's public reporting is described in the public reporting section below. In addition to the required annual reporting, Alaska 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 annual disproportionality report.

Administration of Part B and Alaska funds through the Grants Management System

In 2014, Alaska implemented a new grants management system. This system allows Alaska EED 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.

Distribution of Revisions to the Guidance for Special Education Personnel

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 EED has authority to revise the document when necessary.

**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 EED'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 provide technical assistance to LEAs.

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

Alaska provides multiple levels of technical assistance to LEAs. General TA is provided to all districts through webinars, conferences, trainings, the EED website and written memos. More intensive district-specific TA is generally provided though telephone calls and onsite visits. An example of effective general TA that EED provides are its online eLearning modules. These modules cover topics such as special education evaluation, IEP development, paraeducator best practices and secondary transition. Alaska provides more 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.

The past five years, 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. 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 provided interagency training in one school district and is planning additional trainings in Alaska.

**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 students with disabilities.**

Alaska ensures that its LEA 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 participates in the Alaska Statewide Special Education Conference (ASSEC) where information relating to Alaska's annual performance on its State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are disseminated and policies and procedures are reviewed with the special education classroom teacher audience. Finally, Alaska EED contributes to special educator preparation at the university level by presenting on special education policy, practice, and performance on SPP indicators.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

The State of Alaska reports to the public on its 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 EED website at http://education.alaska.gov/rcsped/. Special Education District Data Profiles are currently available for FFY18 data (2018-19 school year) and prior years.

Alaska EED 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.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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 2018 SPP/APR**

Alaska will report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) in the State Systemic Improvement Plan due April 1, 2021.

OSEP's determinations for Alaska in 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. OSEP's June 2020 letter informed Alaska that it must report 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.

Alaska accessed technical assistance from: OSEP, by participating in OSEP's monthly technical assistance calls and receiving individualized technical assistance from multiple OSEP state leads; the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) ; the National Center on Systemic Improvement (NCSI); and the IDEA Data Center (IDC) by receiving individualized TA and participating in cross-state webinars.

Alaska EED EED took many actions as a result of that technical assistance that will help to increase results for children with disabilities through systemic change. Alaska continued refining its data collection instructions and processes. Alaska chose to focus on indicators related to graduation, dropout, and secondary transition that leads too improved post-secondary outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14), and continued to develop interagency relationships related to secondary transition and continued communication mechanisms through NTACT work. As a result of TA received from OSEP and NCSI, Alaska also refined the improvement efforts in its SSIP to be more feasible and measurable.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 40.27% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 41.86% | 57.02% | 53.87% | 58.73% | 56.94% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 1,200 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 60%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 1,200 | 56.94% | 90.00% | 60%2 | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain*.***

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

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

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

NO

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 6.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 5.50% | 5.50% | 5.20% | 5.00% | 5.20% |
| Data | 5.91% | 5.36% | 6.10% | 5.23% | 5.16% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 5.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

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

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 797 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 87 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 6 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 307 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 5 |

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 390 | 7,964 | 5.16% | 5.00% | 4.90% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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 below.**

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 97.10% | Actual | 95.69% |  | 91.86% | 92.66% | 92.50% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 97.20% | Actual | 95.42% |  | 91.74% | 92.53% | 92.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 92.50% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 92.53% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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

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

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

This indicator does not apply for FFY 2019 due to the waiver of statewide assessment requirements for the 2019-20 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2016 | Target >= | 9.60% | 9.65% | 9.70% | 9.75% | 11.23% |
| **A** | Overall | 11.08% | Actual | 9.61% |  | 11.08% | 12.92% | 11.24% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group**  | **Group Name** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2016 | Target >= | 8.50% | 8.55% | 8.60% | 8.65% | 10.21% |
| **A** | Overall | 8.83% | Actual | 8.50% |  | 8.83% | 10.45% | 10.21% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 11.25% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 10.30% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

NO

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 11.24% | 11.25% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 10.21% | 10.30% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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

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

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

There are no data for this indicator for FFY 2019. Alaska obtained a waiver for the administration of statewide assessments in Spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

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

**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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 4.00% | 3.80% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.00% |
| Data | 2.04% | 8.00% | 0.00% | 7.84% | 10.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 3.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3 | 53 | 10.00% | 3.00% | 5.66% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

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

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

In Alaska, significant discrepancy is defined as a district's rate being 1% or more above the current year's state average rate when looking at the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. For Indicator 4, Alaska established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 students with IEPs enrolled in in the school district and a minimum "n" size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for 10 or more days.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

For the three districts identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the examination of 2018-2019 data, Alaska EED reviewed the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted both as a part of the cyclical monitoring in FFYs 2019 and 2020 and through desk monitoring. The monitoring included reviewing policies, procedures and practices related to IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Alaska DEED staff reviewed files for all students with IEPs that were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. When noncompliance is identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, Alaska requires districts to revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Alaska verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 2.04% | 0.00% | 1.96% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

38

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 5 | 0 | 16 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

YES

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

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

For Indicator 4, Alaska established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 students with IEPs enrolled in in the school district and a minimum "n" size of at least 3 students with IEPs that are suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. 16 districts met the minimum "n" size in the 2018-2019 school year.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

For the five districts identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the examination of 2018-2019 data, Alaska EED reviewed the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted both as a part of the onsite cyclical monitoring in FFY 2019 and through desk monitoring. The monitoring included reviewing policies, procedures and practices related to IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Alaska EED staff reviewed files for all students with IEPs that were suspended or expelled for 10 or more days. When noncompliance is identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, Alaska EED requires districts to revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Alaska verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs 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**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 58.50% | 59.00% | 59.50% | 60.00% | 65.00% |
| A | 55.30% | Data | 77.47% | 63.39% | 63.71% | 64.15% | 65.01% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 12.50% | 12.00% | 12.00% | 11.50% | 9.00% |
| B | 13.60% | Data | 6.05% | 8.84% | 9.05% | 9.17% | 8.90% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.45% |
| C | 1.90% | Data | 2.74% | 2.73% | 2.85% | 2.57% | 2.45% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 65.00% |
| Target B <= | 9.00% |
| Target C <= | 1.85% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 16,999 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 10,910 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,779 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 349 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 61 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 14 |

**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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 10,910 | 16,999 | 65.01% | 65.00% | 64.18% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,779 | 16,999 | 8.90% | 9.00% | 10.47% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 424 | 16,999 | 2.45% | 1.85% | 2.49% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

NO

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B** | Alaska has had a steady increase of students placed in regular classrooms more than 80% of the day the past 10 years. This year, that number slightly decreased, with those students moving to the other categories, which stakeholders agree is a natural fluctuation that looks larger for this part of the indicator because of the small numbers of students. |

**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:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

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

**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**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 27.00% | 27.50% | 27.50% | 28.00% | 28.00% |
| A | 27.60% | Data | 29.79% | 28.13% | 22.78% | 23.91% | 22.81% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% |
| B | 38.80% | Data | 41.94% | 44.21% | 49.44% | 49.79% | 49.78% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 28.00% |
| Target B <= | 38.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 2,474 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | 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 | 629 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 1,231 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 2 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 | 629 | 2,474 | 22.81% | 28.00% | 25.42% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 1,234 | 2,474 | 49.78% | 38.00% | 49.88% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

NO

**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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 72.00% | 74.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% |
| A1 | 71.60% | Data | 76.46% | 79.97% | 79.90% | 85.10% | 87.00% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 46.00% | 48.00% | 48.00% | 49.00% | 44.00% |
| A2 | 61.90% | Data | 47.20% | 47.70% | 45.03% | 45.88% | 44.84% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 76.60% | 76.80% | 76.80% | 77.00% | 77.30% |
| B1 | 77.20% | Data | 82.21% | 82.74% | 86.10% | 84.80% | 88.21% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 45.00% | 46.00% | 46.00% | 46.50% | 46.50% |
| B2 | 63.80% | Data | 43.58% | 44.67% | 44.69% | 45.65% | 46.56% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 74.20% | 74.60% | 74.60% | 75.00% | 75.20% |
| C1 | 75.10% | Data | 79.89% | 80.58% | 80.67% | 83.18% | 84.59% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 48.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% | 49.00% |
| C2 | 68.70% | Data | 51.59% | 51.63% | 51.71% | 50.57% | 49.89% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 75.50% |
| Target A2 >= | 62.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 77.30% |
| Target B2 >= | 63.90% |
| Target C1 >= | 75.20% |
| Target C2 >= | 68.80% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

746

**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 | 12 | 1.61% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 84 | 11.26% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 319 | 42.76% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 252 | 33.78% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 79 | 10.59% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 571 | 667 | 87.00% | 75.50% | 85.61% | 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)* | 331 | 746 | 44.84% | 62.00% | 44.37% | Did Not Meet 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 | 7 | 0.94% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 60 | 8.04% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 378 | 50.67% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 262 | 35.12% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 39 | 5.23% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 640 | 707 | 88.21% | 77.30% | 90.52% | 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)* | 301 | 746 | 46.56% | 63.90% | 40.35% | Did Not Meet Target | 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 | 13 | 1.74% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 66 | 8.85% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 298 | 39.95% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 284 | 38.07% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 85 | 11.39% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)*  | 582 | 661 | 84.59% | 75.20% | 88.05% | 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)* | 369 | 746 | 49.89% | 68.80% | 49.46% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B2** | The slippage for item B2 may be due to the nature of the assessments for looking at acquisition of knowledge due to the other areas. This is an area where the expectations of students increases significantly from ages 3 to 5. Alaska is working with districts to identify strategies to ensure students are appropriately assessed. |

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

For indicator 7 each district is required to use the following instructions:
Indicator 7 data must be collected for all children with an IEP ages 3 through 5 who have not yet entered kindergarten. Entry data will be collected in the district within two months of program entry. Exit data will be collected in the district when the child exits due to ineligibility or beginning kindergarten. Districts may use any of the following assessment tools to gather the entry and exit data: Dial 3, Brigance, Battelle, AGS, AEPS, or one approved by EED. The data from this form will be reported to EED 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.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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 ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 51.00% | 51.00% | 51.00% | 51.00% | 60.00% |
| Data | 54.58% | 52.36% | 62.96% | 60.81% | 62.69% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 60.00% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,583 | 2,333 | 62.69% | 60.00% | 67.85% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

20,032

**Percentage of respondent parents**

11.65%

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

Each survey includes a group of questions that are used for this indicator which are combined for all students. Some questions are asked only to high school parents, but they are not included in this indicator.

| **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 |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | YES |

**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.**

Complete survey and demographic information was collected for 2,333 respondents from a target population of 20,032. This constitutes a 11.6% response rate, an average rate of return for mail-based surveys. The response rate, when coupled with select demographic analyses of respondents, provides a clearer understanding of the validity and accuracy of the survey data. Alaska examined the representativeness of respondents by ethnicity, disability categories, select demographic characteristics, and sex. The survey data appear to be representative of the Target Population.

However, there are several areas where Alaska can continue to improve upon that representativeness. Caucasians were over-represented by 9.2% in the results and Alaska Natives were under-represented by 6.4%. All other ethnic and racial subgroups were represented within +/- 3% of the target population. Parents of students with Specific Learning Disabilities were under-represented by 6.7%.

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

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "Caucasians were over-represented by 9.2% in the results, Alaska Natives were under-represented by 6.4% and parents of students with specific learning disabilities were under-represented by 6.7%." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative.

## 8 - Required Actions

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

# 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 FFY 2018, 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 3.85% | 3.70% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% |

**FFY 2019 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 and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 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 EED 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 EED invited a stakeholder group including educators, parents, and other representatives to help define disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The stakeholders reviewed statewide and district by district risk ratio data and agreed to a risk ratio of 2.5.

Alaska uses one year of data in the calculation.

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

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

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

The one district identified in FFY 2019 was 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 2019.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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 FFY 2019, 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 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 11.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 13.33% | 6.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target  | 0% |

**FFY 2019 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.**

16

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 17 | 0 | 38 | 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 EED 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 EED 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 defined disproportionate representation as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher.

Alaska uses one year of data for calculating disproportionate representation.

Minimum “n” size

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

Based on the application of this minimum “n,” 16 of 54 districts in Alaska were excluded from the calculation for this indicator for FFY 2019.

**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 EED 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 17 districts.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.98% | 96.89% | 97.21% | 97.45% | 96.85% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,052 | 2,831 | 96.85% | 100% | 92.76% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

Alaska's data for this indicator are the lowest in the history of the SPP/APR and districts report that the slippage is due to the school closures due to COVID-19. Alaska'a timeframe (90 calendar days) does not allow for flexibility when schools are closed. When schools reopened, districts adjusted quickly to new procedures for conducting virtual eligibility determinations, but some evaluations were not completed within timelines. Alaska EED is working with districts to mitigate these delays this year and in the future.

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

221

**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 221 eligibility determinations completed beyond the timeline: 39 were completed within between 91 and 95 calendar days; 54 were completed between 96 and 105 calendar days; 27 were completed between 106 and 115 days; and 101 were completed after more than 115 calendar days. The following reasons for delay were reported by school districts: 23 evaluator unable to test due to weather; 75 one or more team members was not available; and 123 for other reasons (1 medical delay, 4 parent delays, 16 teacher delays, and 102 COVID closure delays).

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 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 EED determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific IDEA or Alaska requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the initial evaluation timelines) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or data collections. Alaska EED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA, and through compliance monitoring. Alaska followed up the data collection with phone calls to LEAs and review of files as necessary to establish 100% compliance. Findings were verified as corrected when data showed 100% compliance for a time period following the finding of noncompliance for each finding.

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

Consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska EED 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 EED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA and through compliance monitoring. Alaska DEED followed up the data collection with phone calls to LEAs and review of files as necessary to establish that each evaluation occurred, although late.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

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

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

# 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.

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.

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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.01% | 96.10% | 97.70% | 92.63% | 96.02% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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.  | 28 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 272 |
| 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.  | 2 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 5 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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. | 272 | 288 | 96.02% | 100% | 94.44% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Alaska's data continue to show a high level of compliance for this indicator and many of the delays were due to districts and local ILP programs implementing new procedures for transition during school closures due to COVID-19. Alaska is also concerned about the decrease in the number of total referrals over the past two years (from 486 in FFY 2017 to 401 in FFY 2018 to 323 in FFY 2019). Alaska EED will work together with the ILP program to ensure all potentially eligible students are referred.

**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**

16

**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 16 IEPs developed beyond the 3rd birthday: 5 were completed between 1 and 10 days after the 3rd birthday; 4 were completed between 11 and 30 days after the 3rd birthday; 5 were completed between 31 and 60 days after the 3rd birthday; and 2 were completed 61 or more days after the 3rd birthday. Two of 16 were not completed because a member of the team did not complete the process by the child's 3rd birthday and 14 of 16 were not completed for other reasons including school breaks and school closures 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 EED collects the data for this indicator through the annual supplemental data collection from each school district. Data reported for this indicator are based solely on the referrals made to LEAs from local Infant Learning Programs (ILPs). The state did not receive notifications from the Part C program during the FFY 2019 reporting period. LEA data for Indicator 12 are collected once each year for the full reporting period and include all students in all school districts that are referred from Part C during the year.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 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 EED determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific IDEA or Alaska requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or data collections. For findings related to Indicator 12, Alaska EED conducted this verification through a review of data submitted by the LEA through the annual supplemental data collection, submitted by each LEA, and through compliance monitoring.

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

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

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

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

 (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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.81% | 97.65% | 96.95% | 97.91% | 96.93% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target  | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,515 | 3,698 | 96.93% | 100% | 95.05% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Alaska's FFY 2019 data continue to show a high level of compliance. Slippage may be due to turnover among staff including staff responsible for reviewing IEPs. In addition, convening IEP meetings at the end of the 2019-20 school year required use of new technology and strategies, to which IEP teams are adjusting. Alaska is providing ongoing training on secondary transition planning for all districts and teachers.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

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

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

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

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

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 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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***

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.

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

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s 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 should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 13.70% | 14.00% | 14.00% | 14.70% | 13.00% |
| A | 16.20% | Data | 12.59% | 13.48% | 15.00% | 13.41% | 13.17% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 43.40% | 43.40% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 56.00% |
| B | 59.20% | Data | 43.94% | 49.41% | 55.53% | 53.18% | 56.72% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 60.40% | 61.00% | 61.50% | 61.50% | 68.00% |
| C | 70.50% | Data | 56.29% | 63.83% | 66.05% | 66.12% | 68.28% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 16.25% |
| Target B >= | 59.25% |
| Target C >= | 70.55% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 457 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 59 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 190 |
| 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) | 31 |
| 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). | 5 |

| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 59 | 457 | 13.17% | 16.25% | 12.91% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 249 | 457 | 56.72% | 59.25% | 54.49% | Did Not Meet Target | 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) | 285 | 457 | 68.28% | 70.55% | 62.36% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B** | The survey was conducted in Summer and Fall 2020 when many students had left employment or were unable to find employment due to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.  |
| **C** | The survey was conducted in Summer and Fall 2020 when many students had left employment or were unable to find employment due to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.  |

**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.

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

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

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

**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.**

Complete survey and demographic information was collected for 457 respondents from a target population of 1,173. This constitutes a 39% response rate, a strong rate of return for telephonic 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. Overall, survey data are representative of the Target Population when examined by race and ethnicity, disability category, gender, and other demographics. However, Alaska recognizes the need to continue to improve upon the representativeness of the response group, including in the following areas:

\* Caucasians were over-represented by 4.5% in the results. All other ethnic and racial subgroups were represented within +/- 3% of the target population.
\* Students who received services under the specific learning disabilities category were under-represented by -3.3% and low incidence categories over-represented by 4.7%.

Alaska will implement strategies to continue to ensure a representative response group including (1) make additional calls to groups at risk of being under-represented; (2) continue to allow responses by phone or in writing; and (3) partner with Stone Soup Group, Alaska's PTI to ensure parents understand the importance of the post-school outcomes survey and will help their students respond.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?  | YES |

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

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "Caucasians were over-represented by 4.5% in the results, students who received services under the specific learning disabilities category were under-represented by -3.3% and low incidence categories over-represented by 4.7%." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative.

## 14 - Required Actions

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

# 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, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 4 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Alaska ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% |
| Data | 100.00% | 0.00% | 25.00% | 16.67% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 70.00% | 80.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 4 | 100.00% | 70.00% | 80.00% | 0.00% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

While Alaska's data show a smaller number reaching settlement agreements, the small number of resolution sessions lends itself to large fluctuations and Alaska EED believes that the resolution sessions served their purpose with families choosing to continue to use other dispute resolution mechanisms.

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

Alaska will compare data to the target when it has at least 10 resolution sessions in a reporting period.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 3 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 3 |

**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 ensures that its State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) are used throughout the year as tools for guiding improvement. The report is the result of ongoing efforts made by Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (EED) staff, stakeholders and district and school staff that provide services to students with disabilities. EED recognizes its districts for implementing improvement activities to meet and sustain compliance and to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

Alaska EED collects SPP/APR data from its data systems and districts as the data are available. EED staff review data to ensure accuracy and consistency across years and districts. EED presents the data to a broad stakeholder group each year to solicit feedback and develop, review and revise procedures, targets and strategies as needed. Based on the data, EED also selects focus areas for additional statewide activities and stakeholder meetings throughout the year. Alaska is committed to improving results and maintaining compliance and uses the 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 Advisory Panel; LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); Alaska Special Education Services Agency (SESA); University of Alaska; and all districts and their staff. The SPP/APR would not be possible without the participation of students and youth with disabilities and their families. This stakeholder group meets at least annually to review APR data and discuss strategies for improvement.

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

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  | 70.00% - 80.00% | 70.00% - 80.00% |
| Data | 88.89% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 70.00% | 80.00% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 3 | 3 | 100.00% | 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 2019. 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

The State’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) attachment was not embedded due to privacy protections.

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Donald E Enoch Jr

**Title:**

State Special Education Administrator

**Email:**

donald.enoch@alaska.gov

**Phone:**

907 465-2972

**Submitted on:**

04/21/21 7:47:08 PM

# ED Attachments

  

1. Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-3)