

Table A – Alaska Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Other: The State did not provide all of the information required under indicator 2. The State did not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A narrative describing what counts as dropping out for all youth, and if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. ▪ The calculation used to determine drop-out rate for youth with IEPs and all youth. OSEP noted that the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (AKEED) reported, on page 4 of the SPP, that the measurement of drop-out rate for youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) is the same as the measurement for all youth. 	<p>The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p>	<p>Other: A. The State did not provide the following information required under indicator 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of children with disabilities who were subject to long-term suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year. ▪ A description of how, if discrepancies occurred, the SEA reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEA 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 this requirement. </p> <p>B. OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new indicator 4B will result in</p>	<p>Other: A. The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA. B. The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

Table A – Alaska Part B

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p> <p>Other: OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new indicator 7 will result in the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required entry data, for the required time period, and that the entry data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Other: An evaluation of the sampling plan for indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2005 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, you also need to explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>
<p>Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State reported an 82.9% level of compliance for indicator 12 in the SPP, specifically the requirements at 34 CFR §300.132.</p> <p>Other: The State did not provide the following information required under indicator 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Account for children included in "a" but not 	<p>Noncompliance: The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this</p>

Table A – Alaska Part B

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>included in "b" or "c." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for delays. </p>	<p>requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>Other: The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: A. The State reported an 80% level of compliance for indicator 15A in the SPP, specifically the requirements at 34 CFR §300.600 and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3) to identify and correct noncompliance identified through monitoring in priority areas as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. C. The State reported an 83.3% level of compliance for indicator 15C in the SPP, specifically the requirements at 34 CFR §300.600 and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3) to identify and correct noncompliance identified through other mechanisms as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Other: On page 35 of the SPP, AKEED reported baseline data had been established at 100%. However, the measures reported on page 34 of the SPP indicated that the baseline data was not, in fact, 100%. The noncompliance identified in the measurement table is addressed above.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

Table A – Alaska Part B

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Other: OSEP noted that the State established a target of 100% for mediation. A target of 100% for this indicator is inappropriate. The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. A higher mediation goal, while appropriate for some States, may not be appropriate if it results in agreements that are not voluntarily implemented. It is better to have a lower percentage of viable, implemented agreements than a higher percentage of agreements, some of which are not voluntarily implemented.</p>	<p>AKEDD should revise the target consistent with these instructions and submit the revised target in the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p>
<p>Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Other: While the State provided some information that allows OSEP to make inferences regarding the State's intended targets for indicator 20, the State did not explicitly indicate that its targets are 100% for both timely data and accurate data reports.</p>	<p>The State must revise the targets in the APR, due February 1, 2007, to clarify that it is the State's intent to reach 100% accuracy and 100% timeliness regarding data reported, whether to OSEP or publicly, under section 618 of the IDEA, in the SPP and in the APRs.</p>