

## Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 38.9%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 39.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 40.1%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised its targets to be less rigorous based on revised baseline data. The State reported that these revisions were made in consultation with stakeholders including the Education Committee of the Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 6.0%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 4.97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 4.72%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR a narrative describing what counts as dropping out for all youth, and if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs and the calculation used to determine drop-out rate for youth with IEPs and all youth. Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (AKEED) provided a narrative description of what counts as dropping out in the revised SPP, page 7, and the calculation used to determine dropout rate in the revised SPP, page 7 and the FFY 2005 APR, page 7. AKEED satisfied this requirement.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 18.2%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 17.3%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 18.2%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 14.3%.</p> <p>The State met its targets and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 97.0% for math and 97.1% for reading. The State met its FFY 2005 targets of 95% for math and reading.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its targets and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 30.7% for math and 41.5% for reading. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 30.0% and 39.4% respectively. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 31.5% for math and 41.6% for reading.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 5.6%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 8.3%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its targets and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR a description of how, if discrepancies occurred, the SEA reviewed and, if appropriate revised (or required the 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>While AKEED reported in its improvement activities for Indicator 4 that it monitors each LEA's policies and monitors individual student files against monitoring standards related to functional behavioral assessments and procedural safeguards, it did not report that <i>for districts where discrepancies occurred</i>, it reviewed and, if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEA 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 that such policies, procedures and practices comply with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170. To correct the noncompliance, the State must describe, in its 2006 APR, the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 for the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2004. In its FFY 2006 APR, the State must also describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 for: (1) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (2) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. (The review for LEAs identified in the FFY 2006 APR may occur either during or after the FFY 2006 reporting period, so long as the State describes that review in the FFY 2006 APR.)</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year's submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>5A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5A are 55.3%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 57.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 58.0%.</p> <p>5B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5B are 13.6%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 12.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 12.9%.</p> <p>5C. The State's FFY 2005</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	reported data for Indicator 5C are 2.0%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 1.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.8%.	
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 42.6%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 49.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 50.6%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include entry data for the required time period and any other required data in the February 1, 2007 APR. AKEED satisfied this requirement.</p>
<p>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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State reported FFY 2005 baseline data of 87.1%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to submit a revised sampling plan prior to or in the February 1, 2007 APR. AKEED submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator in its APR. The sampling plan is not technically sound. However, the State reported that, beginning in FFY 2006, it will discontinue the use of sampling for this indicator and submit census data.</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b>		
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State reported FFY 2005 baseline data of 1.9%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets of 0% and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State identified 1.9% of districts (1 of 54) with disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrates that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, as required by 34 CFR §300.173. Additionally, the State must include data and information that demonstrates that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2005 baseline data of 11.1%.</p>	<p>The State provided targets of 0% and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State identified 11.1% of districts (6 of 54) with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrates that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children in specific disability categories, as required by 34 CFR §300.173. Additionally, the State must include data and information that demonstrates that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</b>		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported data based on a</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>(or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>indicator are 95.7%.</p>	<p>State-established timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted. However, the State did not include the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays. AKEED must include this information in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 74.6%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 82.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.  The State reported that prior noncompliance was corrected.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.  OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating the correction of noncompliance identified in the SPP. In Indicator 15, the State reported that prior noncompliance was corrected.  In the February 28, 2006 response letter OSEP also required the State to use the correct measurement and include the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for delays. AKEED satisfied this requirement.  The State must review its revised improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124, including correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's reported FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator are 87.6%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.  OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been</p>	<p>A plan that describes how data will be collected was</p>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how the data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>provided.</p>	<p>the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not submit definitions of competitive employment or post-secondary school as required by the instructions for the February 1, 2007 submission. The State must submit this information in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 92.2%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 70.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that prior noncompliance was corrected.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include data demonstrating compliance with this requirement in the February 1, 2007 APR and to review, and if necessary, revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they would enable the State to include data in the APR that demonstrate full compliance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E). The State reported that prior noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner in all but one school district. In that school district, noncompliance was corrected within 16 months. The State must review its improvement activities, and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that the State will be able to provide data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

### Alaska Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515(a).</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 73%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 78%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 77%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's February 28, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to revise its targets in the February 1, 2007 APR because a target of 100% for this indicator is inappropriate. AKEED revised its targets in the SPP and met this requirement.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>