

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 40.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 43.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 5.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 5.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 13.3%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 13.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 14.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.2% for reading and 97.3% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.1% for reading</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97.5% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95.0%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results. 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, for the High School Graduation Qualifying Examination (HSGQE), the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments 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 Standards Based Assessment (SBA), the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments 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>The State reported that it “will be able to demonstrate compliance no sooner than November 30, 2012” with the requirements for the HSGQE.</p>	<p>with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school levels 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 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>In the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2011 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 45.2% for reading and 38.0% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 49.6% for reading and 40.4% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 49.9% for reading</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and 40.9% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 5.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 5.3%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that four of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</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 requirements relating to the development and implementation of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 5.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</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 reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																				
<p>IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that four of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in any race/ethnicity group identified with a significant discrepancy.</p> <p>The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>																					
<p>5. 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; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 662 1583 1138"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">56.9</td> <td align="center">58.8</td> <td align="center">57.2</td> <td align="center">1.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.8</td> <td align="center">11.5</td> <td align="center">12.6</td> <td align="center">1.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">NA</td> <td align="center">2.6</td> <td align="center">2.1</td> <td align="center">NA</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B from the FFY 2009 data. The State reported that its FFY 2009 data reported in Indicator 5C in the FFY 2009 APR are not consistent with the reporting requirements. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage for 5C. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.9	58.8	57.2	1.90%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.8	11.5	12.6	1.30%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	NA	2.6	2.1	NA	<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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.9	58.8	57.2	1.90%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.8	11.5	12.6	1.30%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	NA	2.6	2.1	NA																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011</p>																				

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																												
education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]		APR.																												
7. Percent of preschool children age 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. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 678 1583 1489"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 683 959 781"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="959 683 1163 781"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 683 1373 781"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 683 1577 781"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 781 959 919"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 781 1163 919">70.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 781 1373 919">68.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 781 1577 919">70.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 919 959 1084"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 919 1163 1084">76.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 919 1373 1084">66.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 919 1577 1084">76.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1084 959 1187"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1084 1163 1187">73.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1084 1373 1187">71.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1084 1577 1187">73.8</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 1187 959 1284"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="959 1187 1163 1284"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1187 1373 1284"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1187 1577 1284"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1284 959 1422"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1284 1163 1422">61.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1284 1373 1422">50.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1284 1577 1422">61.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1422 959 1489"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1422 1163 1489">59.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1422 1373 1489">44.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1422 1577 1489">59.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	70.9	68.8	70.9	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	76.2	66.3	76.2	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	73.8	71.0	73.8	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	61.0	50.3	61.0	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of	59.3	44.0	59.3	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.  The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>																											
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	70.9	68.8	70.9																											
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	76.2	66.3	76.2																											
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	73.8	71.0	73.8																											
<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>																											
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	61.0	50.3	61.0																											
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of	59.3	44.0	59.3																											

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)				
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	67.0	57.0	67.0	
	These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 49.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 49.0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 49.5%.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to report in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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. The State provided all of the required information.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that none of the 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>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 33 of 54 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “10 students with IEPs in the racial/ethnic group of interest (when examining child count data) and/or 10 students on the remaining of all other students who serve as the comparison group for that racial/ethnic group of interest.”</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that six districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that none of the districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</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 "10 students with IEPs in the racial/ethnic group of interest (when examining child count data) and/or 10 students on the remaining of all other students who serve as the comparison group for that racial/ethnic group of interest."</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 20 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>2010 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 94.0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.																				
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 565 1583 1105"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">16.2</td> <td align="center">14.2</td> <td align="center">16.4</td> <td align="center">-2.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">59.2</td> <td align="center">50.6</td> <td align="center">59.4</td> <td align="center">-8.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">70.5</td> <td align="center">69.2</td> <td align="center">70.7</td> <td align="center">-1.30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	16.2	14.2	16.4	-2.00%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	59.2	50.6	59.4	-8.60%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	70.5	69.2	70.7	-1.30%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	16.2	14.2	16.4	-2.00%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	59.2	50.6	59.4	-8.60%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	70.5	69.2	70.7	-1.30%																		
<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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings</p>																				

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that all 1223 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.	<p>of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 3B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on six complaints. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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>Resolution data until July 2012.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that one of six resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. 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>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that seven of nine mediations resulted in mediation agreements. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. 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>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Alaska Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.	
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>