

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 43.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 40.1%. The State did not meet its target of 55.8%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 6.4%. The State did not meet its target of 5.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 13.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 21.9%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 13.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the target for FFY 2010 and the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised target. The revised target is less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.1% for reading and 97.5% for math. These data remain unchanged for reading and represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.3% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results. However, the data posted at the Web link provided by the State do not show that the State met the reporting requirements in 34 CFR §300.160(f), for the following reasons: the data do not provide the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments at the district and school levels, 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.</p>	<p>efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level 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). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments at the district and school levels, 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. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this response table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		CFR §300.160(f).
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 49.6% for reading and 40.4% for math. These data represent progress for reading and progress for math from the FFY 2008 data of 46.5% for reading and 37.5% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 47.8% for reading and 40.4% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results. However, the data posted at the Web link provided by the State do not show that the State met the reporting requirements in 34 CFR §300.160(f), because the data do not provide, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, at the district and school levels.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level 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). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this response table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must continue</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, and improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 1.9%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5.8%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that two of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten children with disabilities enrolled and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 5.8%.</p> <p>The State reported that eight districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that three districts were identified as having 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</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the districts identified</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that two of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten children with disabilities enrolled in any racial or ethnic group with significant discrepancies and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through these reviews.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEAs’ 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) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data.</p>	<p>with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on these revisions. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 548 1583 1021"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">56.6</td> <td align="center">56.9</td> <td align="center">56.9</td> <td align="center">0.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">13.2</td> <td align="center">12.76</td> <td align="center">12.8</td> <td align="center">0.44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.1</td> <td align="center">2.11</td> <td align="center">2.1</td> <td align="center">-0.01%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and did not meet its targets for 5B and 5C.</p>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.6	56.9	56.9	0.30%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.2	12.76	12.8	0.44%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.1	2.11	2.1	-0.01%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.6	56.9	56.9	0.30%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.2	12.76	12.8	0.44%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.1	2.11	2.1	-0.01%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																				

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
[Results Indicator; New]																														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the baseline, targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 545 1583 1455"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 545 957 712"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 545 1163 712"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 545 1373 712"><u>Revised Baseline FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 545 1583 712"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 712 957 849">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 712 1163 849">71.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 712 1373 849">70.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 712 1583 849">70.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 849 957 1018">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 849 1163 1018">77.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 849 1373 1018">76.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 849 1583 1018">76.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1018 957 1122">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1018 1163 1122">75.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1018 1373 1122">73.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1018 1583 1122">73.8</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1122 957 1219"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1122 1163 1219"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1122 1373 1219"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1122 1583 1219"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1219 957 1356">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1219 1163 1356">61.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1219 1373 1356">61</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1219 1583 1356">61</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1356 957 1455">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1356 1163 1455">63.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1356 1373 1455">59.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1356 1583 1455">59.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>Revised Baseline FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	71.6	70.9	70.9	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	77.2	76.2	76.2	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.1	73.8	73.8	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	61.9	61	61	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including	63.8	59.3	59.3	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>Revised Baseline FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	71.6	70.9	70.9																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	77.2	76.2	76.2																											
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	75.1	73.8	73.8																											
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	61.9	61	61																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including	63.8	59.3	59.3																											

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	early language/ communication) (%)				
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	68.7	67	67	
	The State provided revised baseline data using FFY 2009 data, therefore OSEP is not comparing FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data. The State met the FFY 2009 targets.				
<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]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 49%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 48.9%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 49%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2009 APR the State provided improvement activities to ensure that the data will be representative.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report whether its FFY 2010 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
<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]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 34 of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten children with disabilities in the racial or ethnic group of interest and/or if fewer than ten students in the “all other students” comparison group and were excluded from the calculation.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 39 of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten children with disabilities in the racial or ethnic group of interest and/or if fewer than ten students in the “all other students” comparison group and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 11 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the early</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 90.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>13. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 96.1%.</p>	<p>them, if necessary.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2010</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 16.2% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 59.2% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 70.5% 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.</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1,042 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described 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, or</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100%.</p>	
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing request. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to include in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, evidence of proper extension of the timeline in any other due process hearing cases for which an extension is needed that occur between March 24, 2010 and the end of 2010. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that the one resolution session held did not result in a settlement agreement.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Alaska Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that all five mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten mediations were held.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2009 target of 85%.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>