Executive Summary:

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

137

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

The vision of the Special Education Services (SES) Section at the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) is to foster positive educational outcomes for all students with special needs through leadership and service. Our mission is to provide an effective system of general supervision and oversight and to assist local education agencies (LEAs) in preparing students for college/work/adulthood for the 21st Century. This is accomplished through:

1. State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report;
2. Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation;
3. Reporting on Data Processes and Results;
4. Monitoring and Accountability;
5. Provision of Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development;
6. Effective System of Dispute Resolution; and
7. Responsible Fiscal Management System.

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) consists of the 17 revised indicators that comprise the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP's) new Results Driven Accountability (RDA) focus on a balance between compliance and improving results for children and youths with individualized education programs (IEPs). The indicators are Graduation, Dropout, Participation/Performance in Statewide Assessment, Suspensions and Expulsions, Least Restrictive Environment, Preschool Least Restrictive Environment, Preschool Outcomes, Parent Involvement, Disproportionate Representation (individually and by specific disability category), Initial Evaluation, Preschool Transition, Secondary Transition, Post-School Outcomes, Resolution Sessions, Mediation, and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). As part of the emphasis upon improved results, measurable and rigorous targets were established with stakeholder involvement for the state to set expectations for achieving high standards in state and local performance. As needed and with stakeholder input, a review and revisions are made to the SPP/APR, including SPP targets, to ensure that all are designed to be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely.

Annual state reporting of performance on the SPP indicators through the APR is an essential component of the accountability system. Annual public reporting on the SPP/APR is accomplished by posting on the ALSDE Web site along with the OSEP State Determination, through dissemination to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and through media advisories. The state also reports annually to the public on the performance of LEAs compared to the state targets. The LEA Performance Profiles are posted on the ALSDE Web site no later than 120 days after submission of the APR each year.

Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation

The Alabama Administrative Code (AAC) is the policy document that sets forth the state rules and requirements for the implementation of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The AAC is updated as needed and undergoes State Board of Education and broad stakeholders review to ensure compliance with federal and state guidelines. It is made available for public comment and then posted for the public at large on the ALSDE Web site; hard copies are provided to LEA staff during numerous statewide, regional, and local meetings throughout the year.

Mastering the Maze is the procedures document that assists the school and provider personnel to complete the required forms through detailed explanations of each form required for the provision of free appropriate public education (FAPE) to all students with IEPs in Alabama, ages 3-21.
Procedural compliance with state and federal requirements is monitored through SES’s Continuous Improvement Process (CIP).

**Monitoring and Accountability**

The SES Section participates with the department's monitoring process, which is a process where multiple sections of the ALSDE monitor LEAs on a cyclical basis. Within this framework, the SES Section conducts a multi-phased process known as the SES Focused Monitoring: Continuous Improvement Process. The SES Continuous Improvement Process provides an effective system of general supervision to (1) support practices that improve educational results and functional outcomes; (2) use multiple methods in identifying and correcting noncompliance within one year; and (3) use mechanisms for encouraging and supporting improvement and to enforce compliance. The implementation of this framework also supports the state's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) accountability plan to improve student growth and achievement, close the achievement gap, increase the graduation rate, and to increase the number of students graduating from high school that are college- and career-ready to compete in our global society. The Continuous Improvement Process consists of a Desk Audit; a System Profile and Fiscal Review; a Student Services Review; and the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Data and Indicator Review. The review is linked to systemic change and utilizes integrated, continuous feedback and support within a risk-based framework. This framework examines the risk potential exhibited by LEAs according to multiple risk elements such as Data Integrity, Results Indicator Data, Fiscal Data, Determination Status and Coordinator Experience. The technical assistance that is generated from these reviews supports change within the LEAs as a result of qualitative and quantitative data that provides for continuous improvement planning.

**Provision of Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development**

The ALSDE views the reporting of the state’s performance through the SPP/APR as a constructive venture that will aid the department in providing targeted technical assistance and professional development that will yield positive results for students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the state. The department is committed to addressing the SPP/APR indicators as a system of improvement rather than isolated factors as we help educators and families create a blueprint to improve the achievement of school and post-school education, employment and adult life outcomes.

The ALSDE has developed a long-term plan that uses the SPP/APR indicators as a system of improvement. Framing this long-term plan is an evaluation design to determine the short-term, intermediate, and long-term results produced by the department's improvement activities. This evaluation plan will utilize a variety of evaluation methodologies, including survey, focus groups, and triangulation of data from extant sources. In turn, the results will direct the technical assistance and professional development.

To ensure that staff continues to build their knowledge and awareness, the department regularly participates in technical assistance calls, webinars and meetings provided by the OSEP and the funded Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) Centers (e.g., the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), the IDEA Data Center (IDC)). Information and resources are also accessed on the various TA&D Center’s Web sites and then disseminated and shared with the LEAs, as appropriate.

**Effective System of Dispute Resolution**

Parents of children with disabilities must be provided with the opportunity to utilize appropriate administrative remedies when they believe that their rights or the rights of their children have been violated or when they disagree with their child's special education services. Alabama's system of effective dispute resolution is structured to facilitate the timely resolution of complaints, mediations, and due process hearing requests required for compliant dispute resolutions. Moreover, Alabama's dispute resolution process is linked into all aspects of its system of general supervision to ensure effective oversight and implementation of IDEA Part B regulations that improve results for students with IEPs and their families.

The ALSDE Web site, includes information and resources (e.g., Help Documents) to assist parents and the public to understand the policies and procedures regarding Dispute Resolutions in the areas of complaints, mediations, and due process hearings. The SES Section also emphasizes the importance of the availability of a continuum of both informal and formal dispute resolution processes, such as effective communication strategies between families and the LEAs, working with parent organizations and stakeholders to resolve issues, and to work with LEAs and IEP Teams to ensure that all families understand the procedural safeguards available to them under the IDEA.

Staff from the SES Section are assigned to track timelines and investigate formal written complaints and due process hearing requests, as well as to track
This process is available as another way to resolve problems or disagreements in a child’s special education program. It is a separate process from due process hearings and to determine what issues may be occurring that may impact the provision of FAPE for students in particular school systems. These dispute resolution patterns, trends, and issues inform both on-site and off-site monitoring activities, as appropriate.

Mediations: This process is available as another way to resolve problems or disagreements in a child's special education program. It is a separate procedure from either filing a complaint or requesting an impartial due process hearing. When an impartial due process hearing has been requested, this procedure may also provide opportunities to reach agreement through a trained, impartial mediator. An agreement reached through mediation may end the need for a hearing. Either a parent or school official may request a mediation. Whenever both local school officials and parents agree to participate in the procedure, a mediation is scheduled.

Complaints: When it is believed that the public agency is violating a requirement of the IDEA, the special education complaint procedure may be utilized as the appropriate administrative remedy. A signed written complaint may be sent to the State Superintendent of Education, Attention: Special Education Services. When a formal complaint is filed, the ALSDE investigates the observed/suspected violations of the IDEA requirements that may have occurred within the OSEP-specified timeline of 60 calendar days from the receipt of the complaint. A specialist will be assigned as complaint contact for each complaint filed.

Impartial Due Process Hearings: An impartial due process hearing is a legal procedure available when a parent or the school system disagrees with any matter relating to the proposal or refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, educational placement of a child, or the provision of FAPE to a child. An additional mechanism known as a resolution meeting, consistent with §300.510(a)(1) and §615(f)(1)(B)(i) of the IDEA, provides that within 15 days of receiving notice of the parent’s due process complaint, and prior to the initiation of an impartial due process hearing under 34 CFR §300.511, the LEA must convene a meeting with the parent and the relevant members of the IEP Team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the due process complaint, unless the parent and the LEA agree in writing to waive the resolution meeting and when the parent and the LEA agree to use mediation to resolve the due process complaint. An independent, impartial hearing officer, assigned by the State Superintendent of Education, will conduct the hearing. Both parties in the hearing are usually represented by legal counsel to present their cases, though this is not required by the regulations. A written decision is issued by the hearing officer after the impartial due process hearing. If dissatisfied, either party may appeal the decision in civil court.

Responsible Fiscal Management System

The intent of a responsible fiscal management system is to ensure compliance and accountability at both the state level and local level regarding federal and state special education funds as prescribed by federal law and/or state law. The SES staff work closely with the ALSDE Accounting staff to prepare our Part B application each year. Administrative and state set-aside budgets are based on needs and priorities identified by SES staff.

Alabama's fiscal management requirements are based on the U. S. Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), which is the general administration requirements applied to all federal funds and the state's general supervision requirements under the IDEA. The ALSDE must ensure fiscal accountability at each phase in the distribution and use of IDEA Part B and Preschool funds. The ALSDE has established policies and procedures for calculating and allocating flow-through funds, as well as reporting and verifying the use of IDEA Part B flow-through funds. The ALSDE follows required procurement procedures when using state set-aside funds. The following guiding principles are used to determine allowable costs by SES and to ensure that the ALSDE and LEAs are fiscally responsible:

1. **Necessary** - Is the expense necessary for the performance of the administration of the IDEA grant?
2. **Reasonable** - Is the expense a valid programmatic or administrative consideration? Is it a fair rate that can be proven and defended? A cost is reasonable if it does not exceed what a district would normally incur in the absence of federal funds.
3. **Allocable** - Cost must be in proportion to the value received and can only be for the benefit of special education. Authorized expenditures cannot benefit other programs other than through incidental benefit.
4. **Adequately Documented** - Documentation must be clear: The amount and exactly how the funds are used, the total cost of the project, and records showing performance and compliance that could facilitate an effective audit. All recipients of IDEA funds must be able to prove that funds were spent correctly and all property purchased must be tracked.

As part of the SES' general supervision system, the Fiscal Management Section works closely with the SES Monitoring Section and ALSDE Accounting to assist with monitoring the LEA budgets for allowable costs; monitoring LEAs for maintenance of effort and requiring the LEAs to use 15% of their VI-B and Preschool budgets if the LEA has been determined to be significantly disproportionate in any of the areas listed in the regulations; reviewing time and effort documentation; monitoring contracts that have been developed as part of state set-aside activities; etc. Staff in the Fiscal Management Section provide technical assistance daily to the LEAs, staff, other state agencies, etc. Staff also provide technical assistance documents and present at state conferences to ensure an accurate understanding of fiscal compliance.

An expectation is that grant monies will be administered in accordance with generally accepted business practices while exercising prudent judgment so as to maintain proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars. We ensure compliance with Uniform Grant Guidance (UGG) and sections of EDGAR.
The Technical Assistance System (TA) is designed to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced-based technical assistance and support to LEAs. The SES section recognizes that a process for delivering technical assistance (TA) to districts, families, and other agencies is an integral component of an effective system of general supervision. The SES section has developed a process for delivering TA that is directly linked with other components of its general supervision system, including the SPP/APR indicators, to improve both compliance and results. The TA structure is designed according to three types: general, targeted, and intensive. Moreover, the TA process consists of several delivery options, including on-site, teleconferences, webinars, and through electronic means, such as Podcasts and Moodle.

**General TA:** The general type of TA includes mass electronic information dissemination to address identified areas of needed TA. The SES Program Coordinator regularly issues News You Can Use informational topic papers to provide information and resources via mass e-mail to the LEAs. In addition, the SES staff develop “one-pagers” to provide information and assistance in multiple areas that are posted on the ALSDE Web site in order to be accessed by the public as well as school personnel. Other examples of general TA include state-wide conferences with specifically-designed content to address common areas of need such as the Council of Administrators in Special Education (CASE) Fall and Spring Conferences, the Alabama Transition Conference, the MEGA Conference (Special Education Strand) conducted each July, and either a Back-to-School Conference or Novice Coordinators Meeting designed especially for Special Education Coordinators in preparation for the school year.

**Targeted TA:** The targeted type of TA consists primarily of regionally-provided TA, such as training across the state to address specific areas in both general and special education (e.g., co-teaching/co-planning, behavior). Examples of targeted TA include those delivered in response to needs identified from monitoring data, such as IEP training or Secondary Transition training. Trainings under targeted TA are delivered by SES staff in each region of the state and attended by personnel from LEAs primarily within that region. Some training efforts, however, are conducted in conjunction with other agencies, such as Alabama’s Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center and the Alabama Disabilities Advocacy Program (ADAP).

**Intensive TA:** The intensive type of TA is delivered to specific LEAs with needs identified through monitoring, dispute resolution, and/or the special education database to correct an identified area of non-compliance or to address another training need in order to improve the provision of a FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for children with IEPs.

**Professional Development System:**

Professional Development (PD) for special education is designed to improve the ability of practitioners to ensure that each child is able to receive a FAPE in the LRE through the appropriate implementation of evidence-based practices that is delivered with fidelity according to the principles of Implementation Science and Adult Learning. Through a network of multiple venues, PD is offered and includes state-wide and regional conferences, dissemination of promising practices, online coursework through LRP Direct Step, and through state initiatives, such as the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) and the Alabama Math Science and Technology Initiative (AMSTI). Professional Development is also conducted in coordination with state agencies, such as the Alabama Department of Mental Health, the Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services, and advocacy centers. In addition, Institutions of Higher Education provide training and PD in areas such as Secondary Transition through modules and conferences. Specialized Treatment Centers provide training and PD regarding low incidence disability areas, behavioral management, and the autism spectrum disorders.

The ALSDE and SES has operated a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) since approximately 2000. In 2017, a new SPDG was awarded to Alabama. The new SPDG focuses upon providing evidence-based PD in positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) and secondary transition to projects throughout the state. Coaching for both parents and school staff is being provided to sustain effective practice and to disseminate findings through professional development at statewide conferences.

The Alabama SPDG’s project design is rooted in the foundation principles of Implementation Science (e.g., Dugman et al., 2011; Michigan Implementation Network, 2010; Fixsen et al., 2005; Fixsen & Blase, 2008; Duda et al., 2011). The data and results yielded by the SPDG projects are being utilized to inform professional development and technical assistance activities throughout Alabama. Additionally, the Alabama SPDG’s project design provided the research base to develop the Alabama State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Multiple demonstration sites are operated throughout the state that employ evidence-based practices rooted within the framework of Implementation Science. Staff within the schools and districts participate regularly in high quality professional development and receive on-going coaching from trained and experienced instructional coaches.
Stakeholder Involvement: Yes, apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

The SEAP consists of a broad range of stakeholders that includes ALSDE staff, parents of students with disabilities, LEA staff (including district coordinators of special education, general and special education teachers, and administrators), individuals with disabilities, adult corrections staff, institutions of higher education staff, Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center staff, Specialized Treatment Center (STC) agency staff, representatives of other state agencies (including Alabama Early Intervention System (AEIS) personnel), representatives of private schools, community organizational representatives, representatives from the state child welfare agency, and representatives from the state juvenile justice agency.

Broad stakeholder input was solicited through several public forums such as the Spring ALA-CASE Meeting, the annual Mega Conference, the Alabama Parent Education Center Conference, interdepartmental meetings, and SEAP Meetings on an annual basis. Each meeting included topics where stakeholders provided input on the SPP/APR and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) data, strategies and activities.

Revisions were made based on SEAP/stakeholder input. Prior to submission to OSEP, the APR was routed through the ALSDE Leadership staff, which includes the Special Education Program Coordinator, the Office of Student Learning Assistant State Superintendent, the Deputy State Superintendent, and the State Superintendent of Education for final approval.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR
The draft FFY 2013 SPP/APR was presented to the SEAP on December 16, 2014, for review and input. In particular, the SEAP provided input on setting annual targets, including the revision of SPP/APR targets for each Part B indicator, for the span of FFY 2013 through FFY 2018. Story boards were used to provide a visual representation of indicator data and provided stakeholders a method to post comments and recommendations related to a specific indicator.

SES encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, consider historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?  
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?  
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR
The draft FFY 2014 SPP/APR was presented to the SEAP on January 20, 2016, for review and input. Specifically, the stakeholders provided input on the indicators in which the ALSDE did not meet the target and demonstrated slippage (i.e., Indicators 5B, 8, 14C, and 15). Note: All indicators, including 14B the SIMR, were available for review and stakeholder input. Story boards were used to provide visual representations of updated indicator data. As a result, the SEAP recommended strategies where the ALSDE might implement strategies and/or activities to improve results. The following guiding questions were offered to stakeholders to frame their data review, discussion, and recommendations:

1. What strikes you about the data?  
2. Why do you think the data appear as they do? What is the story behind the baseline?  
3. What specific improvement strategies and/or activities would you recommend the state employ to improve results?

FFY 2015 SPP/APR
The data for all indicators of the draft FFY 2015 SPP/APR were presented to the SEAP on January 18, 2017, for review and input. Specifically, the stakeholders were encouraged to provide input on the indicators in which the ALSDE did not meet the target and demonstrated slippage (i.e., Indicators 5B, 7A2, and 16). **Note:** All indicator data, including 14B the SIMR, were available for review and stakeholder input. Story boards were used to provide visual representations of updated indicator data. As a result, the SEAP were encouraged to recommend strategies where the ALSDE might implement to improve results. **Note:** No additional strategies and/or activities were recommended by stakeholders. Additionally, broad stakeholder input was sought for infrastructure changes related to Indicators 8, 13, and 14.

- For Indicator 8, SEAP members were asked to provide guidance on the ALSDE's revised collection method for the Parent Survey.
- For Indicators 13 and 14, stakeholders were asked for input on how the ALSDE can assist the LEAs in making transition information available to families at times other than IEP meetings.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR
The indicator data of the draft FFY 2016 SPP/APR were presented to the SEAP in July 2017 for stakeholder input and draft provided in January 2018 for stakeholder review and input. Specifically, the stakeholders were encouraged to provide input on state improvement efforts. Story boards were used to provide visual representations of updated indicator data. As a result, the SEAP were encouraged to recommend strategies where the ALSDE might implement to improve results. **Note:** No additional strategies and/or activities were recommended by stakeholders after the July 2017 presentation of data. Although no additional strategies and activities were recommended, the SEAP suggested that the state focus on several priorities, to include transition and...
post school outcomes (i.e., increased awareness around Indicator 14b and 14c; improved results for 14b). For the January 2018 review and input, there were no recommended strategies and activities provided. However, a couple of stakeholders wanted an opportunity to amend feedback for Indicator 1 and Indicator 3c. The ALSDE will provide an additional opportunity for feedback and, if appropriate, will include in the APR during clarification. Additionally, stakeholder input was gathered in the form of parent/family focus groups lead by the Alabama Parent Education Center (APEC) to gain insight from the parent/family perspective on recommended strategies and activities on how to better serve students transitioning from high school.

The ALSDE will provide an additional opportunity for feedback and, if appropriate, will include in the APR during clarification.

Additionally, stakeholder input was gathered in the form of parent/family focus groups lead by the Alabama Parent Education Center (APEC) to gain insight from the parent/family perspective on recommended strategies and activities on how to better serve students transitioning from high school.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(ii)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The SPP/APR is shared with the public and media primarily via the ALSDE’s Web site. The FFY 2015 SPP/APR may be found at www.alsde.edu and through the following path: hover over Support Systems; click Special Education Services under the General Information header; click Data Reporting on the side menu; then select the SPP/APR tab.

Once the SPP/APR has been posted, a media news release is sent to over 1,000 forums statewide, including to state board members, LEAs, public information officers, education organizations, and press secretaries for the governor and the Alabama congressional delegation.

The LEA Performance Profiles may also be accessed on the ALSDE Web site (www.alsde.edu) by selecting the IDEA Public Reporting tab on the Special Education Services page. Both the SPP/APR and LEA Performance Profiles are posted no later than 120 days following the State’s APR submission on the OSEP required submission date, generally on February 1st.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response
Indicator 1: Graduation
Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2011
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator:
Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>53.70%</td>
<td>57.60%</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>53.79%</td>
<td>76.94%</td>
<td>64.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>29.60%</td>
<td>32.54%</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>29.70%</td>
<td>53.79%</td>
<td>76.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2015 Data
Target ≥ 65.30%
Data 72.39%

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator:
Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

FINDING NO. 1 - ALSDE’s System of Internal Control Did Not Provide Reasonable Assurance that Reported Graduation Rates Were Accurate and Complete. ALSDE agreed with our finding and provided a corrective action plan in response to the recommendations. ALSDE’s planned corrective actions include revision [to] its compliance monitoring process to include a risk-based indicator to monitor LEAs’ systems of internal control and processes performed throughout the cohort period to ensure that data submitted to the ALSDE are accurate and complete, developing a student data application that will contain student transcript information and can be used during ALSDE’s transcript audit process, creating written procedures for the manual adjustment process, and requiring LEAs to certify to the effectiveness of their systems of internal control and the accuracy and completeness of data submitted to the ALSDE. (p. 9)

FINDING NO. 2 - Alabama Misreported ACGR Data to the Department. ALSDE agreed with our finding and provided a corrective action plan in response to the recommendations. ALSDE’s corrective action plan stated that ALSDE will include in its ACGR only students whose coursework is fully aligned to the State’s core academic content standards. In addition, ALSDE will submit a letter to the Department disclosing that its ACGR data for SYs 2010-11 through 2013-14 were unreliable. Additionally, where the data are reported to the public, ALSDE will annotate the unreliable data. (p. 15)

The ALSDE submitted a corrective action plan on May 2, 2017, that addressed the two OIG findings and recommendations. The corrective action plan is included in the report beginning on page 22. The Special Education Services Section will participate in the corrective actions with other ALSDE Sections, including Counseling and Guidance, Instructional Services, Prevention and Support Services (the ACGR data owner), and Information Systems to ensure that systems of internal controls are developed and implemented and to ensure that data submitted by the LEAs to the ALSDE are accurate and complete, students are counted in the right cohort, and LEAs maintain documentation supporting student removal from a cohort. Moreover, the ALSDE will develop and implement written policies and procedures for the ALSDE staff for reviewing requests for manual adjustments in the Cohort Application, including
The ALSDE responded to the recommendation to remove AOD/ Essentials/ Life Skills Pathway graduates from the ACGR until it can be shown that the program is fully aligned with the Alabama standard diploma academic requirements (p. 30). It should be noted that students with significant cognitive disabilities on the Alternate Achievement Standards (AAS) Pathway are not included in the federal graduation rate. The ALSDE will include students whose coursework was fully aligned to the state’s core academic content standards in the ACGR for the state, local education agencies and local high schools. A series of ALSDE memos to City and County Superintendents formalized this requirement.

Graduation Conditions
Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR
Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

To qualify for the Alabama High School Diploma (AHSD), all students must pass a minimum of 24 credits of coursework—Mathematics (4), Science (4), Social Studies (4), English (4), Physical Education (1), Health Education (0.5), Career Preparedness (1), Career and Technical Education and/or Foreign Language and/or Arts Education (3), and Electives (2.5). Additional credits may be added at the discretion of each LEA’s board of education.

The AHSD provides youth with multiple pathways to graduate: the General Education Pathway, the Essentials Pathway, or the Alternate Achievement Standards (AAS) Pathway. Only youth completing core courses that are fully-aligned to the General Education Pathway are counted in the federal graduation rate.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No
Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

### Historical Data

#### Baseline Data: 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>11.71%</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]</th>
<th>Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>4,629</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status | Slippage
--- | ---
Met Target | No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Use a different calculation methodology

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

The state of Alabama utilizes the Common Core of Data (CCD) definition of a dropout, where the count of dropouts is used to produce an event dropout rate each year as well as to project a four-year dropout rate for a given cohort. According to the CCD definition, a dropout is an individual who (1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; (2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and (3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or system-approved education program and does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: transferred to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved education program; temporary absence due to suspension or school-approved illness; or death.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?  No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Indicator 2: Drop Out

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2013
FFY 2015 Target ≥ Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability

Subgroup

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part B Introduction Page</td>
<td>11/6/17</td>
<td>Number of districts in the State</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?
- Yes  - No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?
- AYP  - AMO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the minimum “n” size</th>
<th>Number of districts that meet the minimum “n” size AND met AMO</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete Data</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.
Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY 2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>98.64%</td>
<td>99.41%</td>
<td>99.69%</td>
<td>95.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY 2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>A ≥ Overall</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>A ≥ Overall</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
**Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? **no**

### Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Participating</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>49,799</td>
<td>48,759</td>
<td>98.18%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>97.91%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Participating</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>49,802</td>
<td>48,727</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>97.84%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

The link to the pages where public reports of assessment results: http://www.alsde.edu/dept/data/Pages/assessment-all.aspx?navtext=Assessment%20Reports:%20Statewide%20Reports.

| Provide additional information about this indicator (optional) |
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2016 Data pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>48.67%</td>
<td>15.68%</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Math       |               |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| A Overall  | 2005          | Target ≥ | Data   | 17.40% | 24.30% |
|           |               | Data | 47.25% | 17.64% | 13.79% |

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
<td>44.20%</td>
<td>51.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>44.90%</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
### Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? Yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? Yes

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned</td>
<td>8122</td>
<td>7975</td>
<td>7505</td>
<td>6966</td>
<td>6601</td>
<td>6032</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned</td>
<td>8122</td>
<td>7967</td>
<td>7510</td>
<td>6972</td>
<td>6596</td>
<td>6019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indication 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2016 Data

Public Reporting Information

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

http://www.alsde.edu/dept/data/Pages/assessment-all.aspx?navtext=Assessment%20Reports:%20Statewide%20Reports

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

### Historical Data

#### Baseline Data: 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target ≤</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target ≤</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.
- Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement.
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2016 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy</th>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status  Slippage
Met Target  No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The ALSDE examines the rate of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State. An LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs is at least two percentage points more than the State’s suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs. The State calculates the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs for each LEA within the State. No minimum “n” size is used. The methodology utilized by the ALSDE is the use of a single state bar to calculate one state-level suspension/expulsion rate and comparing that rate to the district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs on an annual basis.

For each of the three LEAs that the ALSDE identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, the State reviewed the LEA's 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 these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. The State also reviewed (1) their procedures for monitoring the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs based on data analyses and identification of patterns, and (2) progress reports documenting the total number of suspensions/expulsions of children with IEPs. The State also required the LEA to review their policies, procedures, and practices. No noncompliance was identified as a result of the review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
### Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2015

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any actions required in last year’s response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State’s only actions required in last year’s response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the three LEAs that the ALSDE identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, the State reviewed the LEA's 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 these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. The State also reviewed (1) their procedures for monitoring the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs based on data analyses and identification of patterns, and (2) progress reports documenting the total number of suspensions/expulsions of children with IEPs. The State also required the LEA to review, and as necessary, revise their policies, procedures, and practices. No noncompliance was identified as a result of the review.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2009

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

The ALSDE examines the rate of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State. An LEA has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs is at least two percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs and more than one student is suspended/expelled. The State calculates the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs from a racial/ethnic group for each LEA within the State; then, using the minimum “n” size of one, excludes any LEA that had one or less student suspended or expelled. The methodology utilized by the ALSDE is the use of a single state bar to calculate one state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all LEAs and all racial/ethnic groups.

The State’s suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs for FFY 2016 (using 2015-2016 data) was 0.39%. An LEA was determined to have a significant discrepancy if its rate of suspensions/expulsions for children with IEPs was greater than 2.39%. A minimum “n” size of one was used; consequently, no LEAs were excluded from the calculations due to the suspension rate greater than 2.39% with only one student suspended/expelled in a racial/ethnic group.

A total of three LEAs were determined to have a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Of those three LEAs determined to have a significant discrepancy, no LEA was determined to have policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and all three complied with the requirements.

**% of Districts with Significant Discrepancy:**

- All racial/ethnic groups = 2.19% (3 of 137)
- American Indian or Alaska Native = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- Asian = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- Black or African American = 2.19% (3 of 137)
- Hispanic/Latino = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- White = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- Two or more races = 0.00% (0 of 137)

*FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.*

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

All races and ethnicities were included in the review.
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any actions required in last year’s response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State’s only actions required in last year’s response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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


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

For each of the three LEAs that the ALSDE identified as having a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, the State reviewed the LEA's 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 these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. The State also reviewed (1) their procedures for monitoring the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs based on data analyses and identification of patterns, and (2) progress reports documenting the total number of suspensions/expulsions of children with IEPs. The State also required the LEA to review, and as necessary, revise their policies, procedures, and practices. No noncompliance was identified as a result of the review.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.
**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>68.05%</td>
<td>75.06%</td>
<td>60.26%</td>
<td>61.26%</td>
<td>62.26%</td>
<td>62.26%</td>
<td>62.26%</td>
<td>62.26%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>67.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>67.05%</td>
<td>79.42%</td>
<td>80.98%</td>
<td>82.30%</td>
<td>82.95%</td>
<td>83.51%</td>
<td>84.82%</td>
<td>83.83%</td>
<td>83.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Target ≥</td>
<td>72.25%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>77.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Target ≤</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Target ≤</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the FFY 2013 APR submission for indicator 5C, the SES Section proposed a 2.75% target, which reflected a zero slope from FFY 2013 through FFY 2017. In FFY 2018, the proposed target was decreased to 2.50%. After reviewing the data and considering the historical trends, stakeholders found the flat target for this indicator as troublesome and expressed the preference to see an effort (with downward moving targets) to lessen the use of separate schools, etc. As a result, the SES Section adjusted the targets to address the concerns of the stakeholders. No changes were recommended for indicators 5A and 5B.

During the FFY 2014 APR submission, the ALSDE did not meet the target and demonstrated slippage for Indicator 5B. An activity recommended by the stakeholders was to research, examine, and drill down by LEAs the issue of the placement of students in more restrictive environments. Then conduct follow-up technical assistance (modules, training on LRE coding, etc.) with LEAs, including IEP team members, to determine the criteria used in making appropriate placement decisions.

During the FFY 2015 APR submission, an activity recommended by the stakeholders was to research, examine, and drill down by LEAs the issue of the placement of students in more restrictive environments. The ALSDE conducted follow-up technical assistance (modules, training on LRE coding, etc.) with LEAs, including IEP Team members, to determine the criteria used in making appropriate placement decisions.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</td>
<td>79,196</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td>
<td>66,141</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served</th>
<th>Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td>
<td>66,141</td>
<td>79,196</td>
<td>83.56%</td>
<td>72.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>79,196</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>79,196</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Historical Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY 2014</th>
<th>FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2015</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>50.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>47.75%</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>b2. Number of children attending separate school</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/13/2017</td>
<td>b3. Number of children attending residential facility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending</th>
<th>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>50.58%</td>
<td>47.75%</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use a different calculation methodology

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY 2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A1 ≥</td>
<td>91.05%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>91.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A2 ≥</td>
<td>83.05%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>83.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B1 ≥</td>
<td>90.95%</td>
<td>91.20%</td>
<td>91.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B2 ≥</td>
<td>65.35%</td>
<td>65.60%</td>
<td>65.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C1 ≥</td>
<td>89.35%</td>
<td>89.60%</td>
<td>89.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C2 ≥</td>
<td>86.45%</td>
<td>86.70%</td>
<td>86.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to...
consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2776.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Children</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2015 Data* | FFY 2016 Target* | FFY 2016 Data | Status | Slippage
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. \((c+d)/(a+b+c+d)\) | 1155.00 | 1265.00 | 89.48% | 89.35% | 91.30% | Met Target | No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. \((d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)\) | 2445.00 | 2776.00 | 86.96% | 88.45% | 88.08% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

The criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” used by the ALSDE is based on categories 6 and 7 in the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). As noted in the FFY 2013 APR, the ALSDE converted to a seven-point scale COSF in order to allow for delineating children who entered and exited in the “comparable to same-aged peers” category and to clearly define “comparable to same-aged peers.” The delineations for measuring progress on the Early Learning Progress Profile (ELPP) standards align to the seven-point scale of the COSF.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The instrument used to gather data for indicator 7 (Preschool Outcomes) is the Early Learning Progress Profile (ELPP), which is a spreadsheet data collection system that employs components of the COSF.

The procedures for gathering the ELPP data involved LEA personnel completing the entry document based on information collected through the eligibility process, teacher observations, and reports for every child receiving special education services within 60 days of the date special education services begin. The exit document must be completed within 30 days of anticipated or actual exit from preschool special education services and for every child who will transition to kindergarten or who exits from preschool special education services for any other reason. Preschool children must have received at least six months of special education services before the case manager completes the exit document.

The LEAs are required to complete the exit ELPP annually during the specified window of April 15 through May 1 for all children exiting preschool programs and transitioning to kindergarten. The ELPP may be completed prior to each annual IEP review date or other intervals at the discretion of the LEA and results may be used in reporting progress and developing the present level of academic achievement and functional performance and annual goals. Additionally, the ALSDE compares the data by entry and exit levels of each child by LEA to determine progress in the three outcomes areas. The LEAs are trained to use this information to examine the effectiveness of curricula, instructional settings, and specially designed instruction to improve outcomes for preschool children with IEPs.
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response
none
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))
Baseline Data: 2010

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>88.30%</td>
<td>88.50%</td>
<td>88.70%</td>
<td>88.90%</td>
<td>74.90%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.13%</td>
<td>75.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>86.80%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>84.20%</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
<td>74.90%</td>
<td>73.20%</td>
<td>73.70%</td>
<td>75.13%</td>
<td>67.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline, Yellow – Baseline, Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>75.88%</td>
<td>76.13%</td>
<td>76.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>76.54%</td>
<td>76.13%</td>
<td>76.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR

During the FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, the ALSDE did not meet the target and demonstrated slippage for Indicator 8. Several strategies were recommended by stakeholders:

- Increase the methods of communication to express and emphasize the importance and relevance of survey completion.
- Have ALSDE staff offer technical assistance to parents regarding special education and parent involvement.
- Increase response rate by providing materials for LEAs to disseminate to all parents.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR

During the FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, the ALSDE asked the SEAP to provide guidance on the proposed revision to the data collection method for the Parent Survey. The proposed change is scheduled to be implemented in time for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR reporting and involves the electronic as well as a hard copy completion of the survey. No additional recommendations were provided by the stakeholders.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR

During the FFY 2016 APR submission, the ALSDE has sought input on how to increase parent involvement to better improve services for students with disabilities. Strategies included:

1) Gathering input from parents and participants on the Alabama Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

2) Meeting with a Family Transition Stakeholder Group throughout the year. Part of the workscope of the group is to offer a parent perspective on services for students.

3) Partnering with the Alabama Parent Education Center (APEC) on several initiatives, including training, transition parent focus groups, and resources for parents. In partnership with ALSDE, APEC developed a handbook to guide parents through the special education process.

4) Meeting with parents during parent focus groups to brainstorm strategies and activities for schools, districts, and states to address parent and family supports.

5) Gathering input from parents through various surveys. Through work on the AL State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and AL State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), the ALSDE gathered input from parents at middle and high school SSIP/SPDG sites through a Foundations Survey. All parents were asked to rate the behavior, safety, climate of schools, and the ALSDE received copies of the results.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</th>
<th>Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5193.00</td>
<td>6432.00</td>
<td>76.54%</td>
<td>75.88%</td>
<td>80.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6432.00</td>
<td>76.54%</td>
<td>75.88%</td>
<td>80.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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

Alabama conducts the parent survey for parents of children with IEPs, ages 3-21 and does not administer a separate preschool data collection for this indicator. Since Alabama does not use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the Alabama Parent Survey results include responses from respondent parents of children with IEPs, ages 3-5 in the participating districts.

Parent Survey Response Group; coefficient alpha (α); response rate

- Children with IEPs, ages 3-5 (n=522); α = .90; 26.62%
- Children with IEPs, ages 6-21 (n=5,100); α = .93; 28.37%

It should be noted that any numerical differences between the above numbers and the total number of respondent parents are due to surveys with missing fields/values regarding the age of respondent’s child(ren).

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The state’s Alabama Parent Survey response rate was 32.26%.

The FFY 2016 demographic data of the responding student sample were compared on 22 indices with the FFY 2016 representative sample approved by OSEP. Difference scores were calculated to determine whether the parents responding to the AL Parent Survey are representative of the population.

### Representativeness of FFY 2016 Responding Sample Compared to the Representative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Indices</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Representative Sample</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Responding Sample</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE/ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deaf/Blindness | 0% | 0.2% | 0.2%
--- | --- | --- | ---
Developmental Delay | 8% | 9.8% | 1.8%
Emotional Disability | 2% | 1.8% | -0.2%
Hearing Impairment | 1% | 0.8% | -0.2%
Intellectual Disability | 7% | 6.3% | -0.7%
Multiple Disabilities | 2% | 3.3% | 1.3%
Orthopedic Impairment | 1% | 0.7% | -0.3%
Other Health Impairment | 11% | 8.6% | -2.4%
Specific Learning Disability | 39% | 32.1% | -6.9%
Speech/Language Impairment | 23% | 24.3% | 1.3%
Traumatic Brain Injury | 0% | 0.5% | 0.5%
Visual Impairment | 0% | 0.6% | 0.6%

According to LaPier, Bullis and Falls (September 2007), responses ±/3.0% are considered “important differences.” These differences are bolded in the “Differences” column in the table above. The indices that were over- or underrepresented among the 2016 sample were:

- **Black** (-3.5%, under)
- **Multi-race** (3.5%, over)
- **Autism** (4.0%, over)
- **Specific Learning Disability** (-6.9%, under)

The state is taking steps to address these differences in future responding samples, which includes providing technical assistance to districts, partnering with the Alabama Parent Education Center, and communicating with disability groups around the state to **encourage parent responses**.

Was sampling used? **Yes**

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? **No**

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

The FFY 2016 Indicator 8 Parent Involvement data represent the second year of a new four-year cohort; it is the first year for this particular sample group. The four selected cohorts are equivalent in their number of students with disabilities, number of LEAs, and in their three index percentages (gender, race/ethnicity, and disability). The sampling plan reflects the Alabama 2013 Child Count demographics.

The following steps outline the methodology used to create a representative sample, in alignment with the OSEP Part B SPP/APR Measurement Table.

**Step 1: Stratify districts by size.** To achieve equivalent size samples, 135 districts are stratified into two groups, based on their student enrollment. Following OSEP's interpretation, the first group is comprised of the largest districts with an average daily membership (ADM) of 50,000 or greater. In Alabama, only the Mobile County School System qualifies. The remaining systems with an ADM less than 50,000 comprise the remaining group.

**Step 2: Select equivalent-size samples.** Four equivalent annual sample groups are selected across the size-stratified groups to create samples that are equivalent in their number of districts and the number of students with disabilities, per the October 2013 Child Count. For Mobile County, the only Alabama district in the largest size group, its schools are divided among the four annual sample groups to preserve their size equivalency.

**Step 3: Adjust samples for indices equivalency.** Once the annual sample groups are selected to have equivalency in number of districts and students with disabilities, their equivalency with regard to the sample indices (student gender, race/ethnicity, and disability) is evaluated. To increase the indices equivalence between sample group percentages and the state population percentages, districts are selected and moved between groups, according to the impact of their indices percentages on the sample group percentages.

As presented in the table below, the Maximum Percentage Variation between any of the two annual sample groups and the Alabama population of students, across 22 index categories, ranges from a low of 0% to a high of 3.3%. For the 22 index categories, 14 (64%) have a maximum percentage variation of less than 1%, six (27%) range between 1% and 2%, and the remaining two (9%) have a maximum percentage variation of between 2% and 3.3.

**Percentage Variations between the Two Annual Sample Groups across Three Sample Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Indices</th>
<th>FFY 2015 (N=80,880)</th>
<th>FFY 2016 (n=17,852)</th>
<th>FFY 2017 (n=17,510)</th>
<th>FFY 2018 (n=17,942)</th>
<th>Maximum Percentage Variation (n=18,194)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RACE/ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY 16</th>
<th>FFY 17</th>
<th>FFY 18</th>
<th>FFY 19</th>
<th>FFY 20</th>
<th>Margin of Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for the gender, race/ethnicity, and disability sampling indices were compiled from the ALSDE October 2013 Child Count and include students with disabilities from 135 LEAs.

---

### DISABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY 16</th>
<th>FFY 17</th>
<th>FFY 18</th>
<th>FFY 19</th>
<th>FFY 20</th>
<th>Margin of Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Blindness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disability</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language Impairment</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for the gender, race/ethnicity, and disability sampling indices were compiled from the ALSDE October 2013 Child Count and include students with disabilities from 135 LEAs.

School districts within the selected annual cohorts are charged with disseminating the Alabama Parent Survey to all parents of students with IEPs ages 3-21 within the district. Districts offer the survey in two formats by: 1) sending a website address to parents to complete the survey online, and 2) providing a paper copy of the survey. For the paper surveys, schools are responsible for disseminating the surveys to parents and collecting completed surveys. The paper surveys are either assembled within the district office and mailed to the ALSDE or mailed directly by the school. In addition to districts sharing the website link to the online survey, the Alabama Parent Education Center (APEC) disseminated the website link to its database of parents.

Verification of entered surveys was conducted by reviewing a random sample of 8% of the surveys. The margin of error was <0.001%. Responses to 11 satisfaction items were calculated to determine parents whose satisfaction ratings were greater than or equal to 80%.

Was a survey used? Yes
Submitted survey: 2017 Parent Survey Instrument electronic
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

To address the deviations in representativeness of Black, Multi-race, autism, and specific learning disabilities categories, the ALSDE will implement the following strategies:

- Provide technical assistance to local Special Education Coordinators regarding the need to ensure demographics are fully representative.
- Provide technical assistance to districts with response rates below 18% to determine strategies for increasing response rates.
- Continue to work closely with the APEC to reach parents through their outreach activities. The ALSDE will ask APEC to include the weblink to the survey on its monthly newsletters.
- Maintain communication with specific advocacy groups around the state, particularly those addressing parents of students with specific learning disabilities.
- Share the weblink to the survey on the Special Education Services page, as well as at statewide conferences with parent participants, such as the Transition Conference and the MEGA conference.
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2005

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation**

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

---

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the State established a minimum n-size requirement?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services</th>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes | No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The ALSDE uses multiple methods to calculate disproportionate representation for racial and ethnic groups. In its definition, disproportionate representation is defined in terms of overrepresentation and includes the risk ratio (RR) and weighted risk ratio (WRR). An LEA is considered to have disproportionate representation for Indicator 9 when both the risk ratio (RR) and weighted risk ratio (WRR) are greater than 2.25 with more than ten students in each racial and ethnic group for three consecutive years. Although the ALSDE has established a minimum cell size of less than or equal to ten for the numerator, a minimum n-size for the denominator has not been established when defining disproportionate representation under Indicator 9.

Data for all racial and ethnic groups were used in the review and analysis for disproportionate representation for each LEA and include: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races.

**Step One**

Using the OSEP Disproportionality Template, all 137 LEAs were included in the calculation of disproportionate representation.

Based on the data for all 137 LEAs, 127 LEAs had a RR and WRR less than 2.25 and showed no disproportionality; whereas, ten LEAs had a RR and WRR greater than 2.25 and showed disproportionality. Of the ten LEAs that showed disproportionality (i.e., had a RR and WRR greater than 2.25), six LEAs had more than ten students in a racial/ethnic group and four LEAs had fewer than ten students in a racial/ethnic group. Therefore, the ALSDE excluded four LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation and determined that six LEAs were identified as having met the minimum n-size of ten and, thus, met the state’s criteria for and determined to have disproportionality.

**Step Two**

In determining if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as part of the data review, the ALSDE reviewed the six LEAs identified in Step One to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

The ALSDE examined LEA child find, evaluation, eligibility and other related policies, procedures, and practices. The ALSDE also conducted a review of individual student records to determine if evaluation and eligibility requirements were met according to the *Alabama Administrative Code* (AAC) and the Part B IDEA requirements.

The LEAs with disproportionate representation were subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices related to their LEA plan. These plans address special education and related services processes (including child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements) to ensure compliance with the IDEA. In all LEAs exhibiting overrepresentation of students for a racial and ethnic group, the ALSDE determined that the disproportionate representation was not due to inappropriate identification.

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

The ALSDE uses the OSEP Disproportionality Template to calculate the risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and if necessary, the alternate risk ratio for all LEAs in the state. The calculated results are then compared to the state’s criteria for disproportionality to determine whether the LEA is identified as having disproportionality. Once an LEA has been identified as having disproportionality, they are notified and are required to review, and if appropriate, revise their policies, practices and procedures used in their identification processes. This requirement for review is conducted every year by the monitoring...
section as a part of the continuous improvement process, in which an LEA is identified as having disproportionality and must include a review of child find and evaluation policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

As a part of Alabama’s process towards continuous improvement, pre-staffing meetings are held to discuss LEA data (e.g., Child Count, LEA SPP/APR compliance and performance data, previous monitoring reports, fiscal information) to determine specific areas of focus and need. Particularly, Child Count related data, which includes disproportionality and placement in the least restrictive environment information, are discussed during the pre-staffing meetings. As a result of the pre-staffing meetings, probing questions from the ALSDE Guided Conversation Bank are reviewed (modified as necessary) and selected by the state staff and then are shared with the LEA Special Education Coordinator. Regarding disproportionality, there are specific questions designed to determine whether the review of policies, practices and procedures has occurred by the LEA and whether the identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification. The LEA is then required to develop an action plan; the state conducts follow-up activities to ensure implementation of plan and provides technical assistance if needed.
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

**Historical Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Data**

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

### Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

**FFY 2016 Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Disability Categories</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disability</td>
<td>2.19% (3 of 137)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>13.14% (18 of 137)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>2.19% (3 of 137)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>0.73% (1 of 137)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell size (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The ALSDE uses multiple methods to calculate disproportionate representation for racial and ethnic groups. In its definition, disproportionate representation is defined in terms of overrepresentation and includes the risk ratio (RR) and weighted risk ratio (WRR). An LEA is considered to have disproportionate representation for Indicator 10 when both the RR and WRR are greater than 2.50 with more than ten students in each racial and ethnic group for more than three consecutive years. Although the ALSDE has established a minimum cell size of less than or equal to 10 for the numerator, a minimum n-size has not been established for the denominator when defining disproportionate representation under Indicator 10.

Data for all racial and ethnic groups were used in the review and analysis for disproportionate representation for each LEA and include: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races. Additionally, the following disability categories were used in the review and analysis for disproportionate representation for each LEA: Autism, Emotional Disability, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment.

**Step One**

Using the OSEP Disproportionality Template, all 137 LEAs were included in the calculation of disproportionate representation.

Based on the data for all 137 LEAs, 23 LEAs had a RR and WRR less than 2.50 and showed no disproportionality in all racial/ethnic groups and in all disability categories; whereas, 114 LEAs had a RR and WRR greater than 2.50 and showed disproportionality in at least one racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories. Of the 114 LEAs that showed disproportionality (i.e., had a RR and WRR greater than 2.50) in at least one racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories, 68 LEAs had ten or fewer students in a racial/ethnic group and 46 LEAs had more than ten students in a racial/ethnic group.

Therefore, the ALSDE excluded 68 LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation and determined that 46 LEAs were identified as having met the minimum n-size of ten and, thus, met the state's criteria for and determined to have disproportionality.

**% of Districts with Disproportionality (Overrepresentation) of Racial/Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories:**

- Autism = 5.84% (8 of 137) were overrepresented for White students; 0.73% (1 of 137) were overrepresented for Black or African American.
- Emotional Disability = 1.46% (2 of 137) were overrepresented for White students; 2.19% (3 of 137) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Intellectual Disability = 0.73% (1 of 137) were overrepresented for White students; 13.14% (18 of 137) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Other Health Impairment = 4.38% (6 of 137) were overrepresented for White students; 2.19% (3 of 137) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Specific Learning Disability = 5.84% (8 of 137) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Speech or Language Impairment = 4.38% (6 of 137) were overrepresented for White students; 0.73% (1 of 137) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.

**Step Two**

1/30/2018
In determining if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as part of the data review, the ALSDE reviewed the 52 LEAs identified in Step One to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

The ALSDE examined LEA child find, evaluation, eligibility and other related policies, procedures, and practices. The ALSDE also conducted a review of individual student records to determine if evaluation and eligibility requirements were met according to the AAC and the Part B IDEA requirements.

The LEAs with disproportionate representation were subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices related to their LEA plan. These plans address special education and related services processes (including child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements) to ensure compliance with the IDEA. In all LEAs exhibiting overrepresentation of students for a racial and ethnic group, the ALSDE determined that the disproportionate representation was not due to inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

The ALSDE uses the OSEP Disproportionality Template to calculate the risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and if necessary, the alternate risk ratio for all LEAs in the state. The calculated results are then compared to the state’s criteria for disproportionality to determine whether the LEA is identified as having disproportionality. Once an LEA has been identified as having disproportionality, they are notified and are required to review, and if appropriate, revise their policies, practices and procedures used in their identification processes. This requirement for review is conducted every year by the monitoring section as a part of the continuous improvement process, in which an LEA is identified as having disproportionality and must include a review of child find and evaluation policies, practices and procedures to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

As a part of Alabama’s process towards continuous improvement, pre-staffing meetings are held to discuss LEA data (e.g., Child Count, LEA SPP/APR compliance and performance data, previous monitoring reports, fiscal information) to determine specific areas of focus and need. Particularly, Child Count related data, which includes disproportionality and placement in the least restrictive environment information, are discussed during the pre-staffing meetings. As a result of the pre-staffing meetings, probing questions from the ALSDE Guided Conversation Bank are reviewed (modified as necessary) and selected by the state staff and then are shared with the LEA Special Education Coordinator. Regarding disproportionality, there are specific questions designed to determine whether the review of policies, practices and procedures has occurred by the LEA and whether the identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification. The LEA is then required to develop an action plan; the state conducts follow-up activities to ensure implementation of plan and provides technical assistance if needed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>84.13%</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>84.13%</td>
<td>94.40%</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>99.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **Gray** – Data Prior to Baseline
- **Yellow** – Baseline
- **Blue** – Data Update

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received</th>
<th>(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22,844</td>
<td>22,772</td>
<td>99.51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status: Did Not Meet Target

Slippage: No Slippage

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

---

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

Given that the number of children included in (a) but not included in (b) is 72, the following numbers indicate the range of days beyond the 60-day initial evaluation timeline when evaluations were completed for children:

- 1-15 days: 33
- 16-30 days: 12
- 31-45 days: 9
- 46-60 days: 2
- 60+ days: 16

The reasons for delays include students failed vision and hearing tests, school delay, central office delay (psychometrist/testing personnel not notified), shortage of qualified testing personnel, practices and procedures, and delay of evaluation processes.

---

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

---

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

---

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

---

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

The SES utilizes the state database to generate a report to collect data for Indicator 11 for each LEA. The LEAs submit data one time each year through the District Approval process for reporting data in the APR. Reported data are for the entire reporting period and all LEAs in the state are included. The result of the calculations are compared to the targets. The actual numbers used in the calculation are provided under Actual Target Data.
### Indicator 11: Child Find

**Required Actions from FFY 2015**

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Using a three-month window interval, the ALSDE verified that 27 LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The ALSDE reports database was accessed to view each LEA's report to determine whether all students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received and evaluated within the 60-day timeline with 100% accuracy. Additionally, the ALSDE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance reflected in the data reported for this indicator are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the state's data system. All reviews of updated data were conducted within one year from the notification of noncompliance. The 27 LEAs identified as having noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2015 were corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For each individual student whose evaluation was not completed within 60 days, the ALSDE accessed the database for all LEAs with noncompliance at three-month intervals to determine whether the evaluations had been completed, although late, for all students still within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Within the database, it was determined that the students who received their required evaluations, even though late, were consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.
## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Historical Data and Targets**

**Baseline Data:** 2005

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

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>76.30%</td>
<td>94.07%</td>
<td>97.88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.64%</td>
<td>99.56%</td>
<td>98.50%</td>
<td>99.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numerator (c)</th>
<th>Denominator (a-b-d-f)</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.</td>
<td></td>
<td>null</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.</td>
<td></td>
<td>null</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that the number of children included in (a) but not included in b, c, d, e or f is 4, the following numbers indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

- 1-15 Days - 1
- 16-30 Days - 0
- 31-45 Days - 0
- 46-60 Days - 0
- 60+ Days - 3

The reasons for delays for all four instances include central office delays.

### What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- **State monitoring**
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The SES utilizes the state database to generate a report to collect data for Indicator 12. The LEAs submit data one time each year through the District Approval process for reporting in the APR. Reported data are for the entire reporting period and all LEAs in the state are included.
**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**  
**Required Actions from FFY 2015**

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

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Using the state database, the state accessed and reviewed each LEA's report in the reports database using three-month window intervals to determine whether all students who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. The ALSDE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance reflected in the data for this indicator are correctly implementing the requirements based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the State's data system. All reviews of updated data were conducted within one year from the notification of noncompliance and were verified as corrected within one year. All noncompliance with Indicator 12 for FFY 2015 was corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and no instance of noncompliance remains uncorrected from previous years.

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

For each individual student who had been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination, the State accessed the database for each LEA with noncompliance at three-month intervals to determine whether the evaluations had been completed, although late, for all students still within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Within the database, it may be determined whether the students have received their required evaluations, even though late, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. All individual noncompliance with Indicator 12 for FFY 2015 was corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and no instance of noncompliance remains uncorrected from previous years.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2009

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**FFY 2016 Data**

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

Compliance indicator: 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.


---

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition</th>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,018</td>
<td>20,037</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The SES utilizes the state database to generate a report to collect data for Indicator 13. The LEAs submit data one time each year through the District Approval process for reporting data in the APR. Reported data are for the entire reporting period and all LEAs in the state are included.

**Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?**

- Yes
- No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?  
- Yes
- No

At what age are youth included in the data for this indicator?  
15

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

Alabama’s procedural document, Mastering the Maze, includes the requirement that transition must be addressed "beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the student is 16, or earlier if appropriate, and updated annually thereafter. For all students entering 9th grade regardless of their age, transition must be addressed". Students who are age 15 but who will turn age 16 during the implementation dates of the IEP are included in the state database.
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

| none |

Note: Any actions required in last year’s response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the “Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance” page of this indicator. If your State’s only actions required in last year’s response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.
**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Using the state database, the ALSDE accessed and viewed each LEA's report to determine 100% compliance during periodic intervals throughout the year. The ALSDE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance reflected in the data reported for this indicator are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the state’s data system. All reviews of updated data were conducted within one year from the notification of noncompliance and were verified as corrected within one year. All non-compliance with Indicator 13 for FFY 2015 were corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

For noncompliance identified in FFY 2015, the SES has verified that all LEAs have corrected each individual case of noncompliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the data system, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015**
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2009 Target ≥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2009 Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2009 Target ≥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2009 Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2009 Target ≥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2009 Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline, Yellow – Baseline, Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the Introduction.

During the FFY 2013 SPP/APR submission and prior to the target-setting effort, Indicator 14 was presented to stakeholders as an option for the state identified measurable result (SIMR). The SIMR was articulated as the “then” statement of the proposed theory of action, which reads as follows:

“Then...students will be able to achieve positive post-school outcomes and engage in higher education and competitive employment opportunities.”

Although the stakeholders reviewed the available data and offered no changes to the proposed targets for Indicator 14, as well as agreed with and supported the spirit of this measure, they recommended that the SES provide more specificity in the measurement by adding percentages to the statement. After subsequent discussions and clarifying how the targets will be used, the stakeholders felt that the discussion and clarification addressed their measurement concern and determined no further action was needed at this time.

During the FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, the ALSDE did not meet the target and demonstrated slippage for Indicator 14C. Stakeholders provided written input and the following strategies/activities are being considered by the ALSDE:

- Review, examine, and if appropriate, adopt the recommendations outlined by the Ad-hoc Transition Family Advocacy Group.
- Provide job-readiness training for students.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR

1/30/2018
During the FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, the ALSDE sought input from stakeholders on how the ALSDE can assist the LEAs in making transition information available to families at times other than IEP meetings. Specifically, the Alabama Transition Family Focus Group (representing a partnership between the ALSDE and our PTI) has met to provide insight and advice to the ALSDE regarding transition service delivery throughout Alabama. As a result of the stakeholders identifying communication with families as a priority to improve transition services leading to improved post-school outcomes, the ALSDE has developed a web landing page for Transition to be launched by early Spring of 2017. The landing page will house current resources and information for parents and professionals regarding transition services, including links to modules from the Iris Center (an OSEP-funded TA center) and the Transition Coalition (an evidence-based resource). In addition, the ALSDE has received targeted technical assistance from NTACT in order to improve the transition infrastructure for delivery of evidence-based and effective resources to families, students, and teachers.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR**

During the FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, the ALSDE continued to seek input on how to better serve students transitioning from high school. Strategies included:

1) Partnering with the Alabama Parent Education Center (APEC) to lead three parent focus groups. The focus groups, conducted in three regions of the state, gathered input from family members of students who were in high school or who had recently graduated. The results of the three parent focus groups yielded data to support transition activities such as: developing the statewide Alabama Transition Landing Page; training for participants on transition topics at the statewide MEGA Conference; and offering training modules on transition from the IRIS Center to parents and teachers. In addition, the focus group results showed a need to emphasize transition planning at a younger age; as a result, the ALSDE included a transition middle school component in its awarded State Personnel Development Grant.

2) Leading parents through the identification of strategies and activities for schools, districts, and states to address transition issues. As part of the parent focus groups, parents brainstormed strategies and activities for parent and family supports, collaboration with other agencies, and community-based experiences for students.

3) Meeting with a Family Transition Stakeholder Group throughout the year. As a continuation of FFY 2015 activities, the ALSDE met with representative partners to discuss the needs around transition and post-school services.
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Reasons for B Slippage**

The FFY 2016 Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes data represent the second year of a new two-year cohort; it is the first year for this particular sample group. Since it is the first year for this sample group, the ALSDE will review the representativeness of the sample compared to the prior year. Based on the drill-down analyses, it was found that significantly lower response rates appeared in some districts. The ALSDE plans to provide technical assistance to these districts to ensure a higher and more representative response rate in the future.

Additionally, there were a number of students with missing values for one component of determining competitive work or post-secondary enrollment eligibility. Further analysis revealed that over 13% of students in the competitive employment analyses were excluded due to missing values (see table below). The findings show a need for additional training to ensure surveys are completed by the interviewers. In fall 2017, ALSDE consultants conducted 289 independent verification interviews for students in the FFY 2016 sample (13.39% of the sample). The results for Indicators 14b and 14c were within 3% of the district-reported results.
The ALSDE has taken the following steps to improve post-school outcomes through the following activities:

1. Launched the Secondary Transition landing page where resources, information, and presentations can be accessed by parents and educators.

2. Sponsored the development and distribution of handbooks for educators and parents detailing secondary transition requirements. A student handbook emphasizing self-determination and self-advocacy is currently being developed.

3. Improved and expanded the State Interagency Transition Team (SITT).

While the ALSDE has made significant efforts in the past two years to improve the post-school outcome results, the activities may not have yet impacted students in the FFY 2016 sampled districts. With additional time and evaluation of efforts, the ALSDE expects these activities to have a greater impact in subsequent reporting years. The ALSDE will conduct the following activities:

1. Sponsor a one-day Transition Conference for teachers and students focusing on improving self-determination/self-advocacy skills.

2. Continue to provide resources and information to LEAs and parents regarding transition instruction, including community-based work experiences, so that students will be able to acquire the skills needed for competitive employment after leaving high school.

3. Highlight and encourage site visits to successful transition programs, such as those participating in the AL SPDG and SSIP.

4. Continue to work with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to receive universal and targeted technical assistance.

5. Continue to strengthen partnerships and linkages with other agencies (e.g., Department of Rehabilitative Services) to assist students with transition planning that improves their post-school outcomes.

Reasons for C Slippage

As stated in Reasons for B Slippage, while the ALSDE has made significant efforts in the past two years to improve the post-school outcome results, the activities may not have yet impacted students in the FFY 2016 sampled districts. With additional time and evaluation of efforts, the ALSDE expects these activities to have a greater impact in subsequent reporting years. Many of the same circumstances that impacted the results achieved for 14b also apply to 14c, particularly with respect to "missing values" on the surveys. However, some additional strategies that ALSDE may undertake with respect to 14c improvement are as follows:

- Expand programs such as Project Search, which emphasize work experience for lower-functioning students in challenging hospital careers, where students who may be involved in "other education" and "other employment categories" may also be the students who become beneficiaries. Additionally, the ALSDE is working to strengthen the transition experiences for students who remain in school until age 21.
- Work with post-secondary programs, such as Crossing Points and Think College, to expand opportunities for students with low-incidence disabilities.

The ALSDE looks forward to reporting improved post-school outcomes for 14b and 14c in the FFY 2017 APR.

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No
Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The FFY 2016 Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes data represent the second year of a new two-year cohort; it is the first year for this particular sample group. The two selected cohorts are equivalent in their number of students with disabilities, number of LEAs, and in their three index percentages (gender, race/ethnicity, and disability). The sampling plan reflects the Alabama 2013 Child Count demographics.

The following steps outline the methodology used to create a representative sample, in alignment with the OSEP Part B SPP/APR Measurement Table.

Step 1: Stratify districts by size. To achieve equivalent size samples, 135 districts are stratified into two groups, based on their student enrollment. Following OSEP's interpretation, the first group is comprised of the largest districts with an average daily membership (ADM) of 50,000 or greater. In Alabama, only the Mobile County School System qualifies. The remaining systems with an ADM less than 50,000 comprise the remaining group.

Step 2: Select equivalent-size samples. Four equivalent annual sample groups are selected across the two size-stratified groups to create samples that are equivalent in their number of districts and the number of students with disabilities, per the December 2013 Child Count. For Mobile County, the only Alabama district in the largest size group, its schools are divided among the four annual sample groups to preserve their size equivalency.

Step 3: Adjust samples for indices equivalency. Once the annual sample groups are selected to have equivalency in number of districts and students with disabilities, their equivalency with regard to the sample indices (student gender, race/ethnicity, and disability) is evaluated. To increase the indices
As presented in the table below, the Maximum Percentage Variation between any of the two annual sample groups and the Alabama population of students, across 22 index categories, ranges from a low of 0% to a high of 3.3%. For the 22 index categories, 14 (64%) have a maximum percentage variation of less than 1%, six (27%) range between 1% and 2%, and the remaining two (9%) have a maximum percentage variation of between 2% and 3.3.

### Percentage Variations between the Two Annual Sample Groups across Three Sample Indices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Female</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE/ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Black</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 White</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Multiple Race</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Autism</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Deaf/Blindness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Developmental Delay</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Emotional Disability</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Speech/Language Impairment</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Visual Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for the gender, race/ethnicity, and disability sampling indices were compiled from the ALSDE October 2013 Child Count and include students with disabilities from 135 LEAs.
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?  

No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The state’s Alabama Post School Outcome Survey response rate was 64.74%. This response rate represents a margin of error of 1.96% (95% confidence interval).

The FFY 2016 demographic data of the responding student sample were compared on 22 indices with the FFY 2016 representative sample approved by OSEP. Difference scores were calculated to determine whether the students responding to the AL Post-School Outcomes Survey are representative of the population.

Representativeness of FFY 2016 Responding Sample Compared to the Proposed Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Indices</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Representative Sample</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Responding Sample</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE/ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Blindness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disability</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language Impairment</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to LaPier, Bullis and Falls (September 2007), the former National Post-School Outcomes Center indicated those responses +/- 3.0% are considered “important differences.” These differences are shaded in the “Differences” column in the table above. The indices that were over- or
underrepresented among the 2016 sample were:

- Female (3.6%, over) and Male (-3.6%, under)
- Black (7.2%, over)
- White (-8.4%, under)
- Developmental Delay (-8.0%, under)
- Intellectual Disability (3.9%, over)
- Specific Learning Disability (21.9%, over)
- Speech/Language Impairment (-20.0%, under)

Differences in the Developmental Delay and Speech/Language Impairment are likely affected by the use of 2013 Child Count demographics and the age of the responding population (ages 3-21 versus transition-age students). The ALSDE compared the FFY 2016 Indicator 14 demographics versus the 2016 Child Count disability demographics for students ages 17-21 years old. The table below demonstrates the differences between the demographics for students of similar ages.

### A Comparison of the FFY 2016 Responding Sample Compared to Students, Ages 17-21, in the FFY 2016 Child Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Indices</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Child Count for Ages 17-21 Years</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Responding Sample</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Blindness</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disability</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language Impairment</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four disability categories indicated in bold font were +/-3.0% different than the representative sample. Only one of these categories, Specific Learning Disability, was greater than the maximum acceptable variation and one category, Intellectual Disability, was less than the maximum acceptable variation. The FFY 2016 Alabama 14 Post School Outcomes Survey data showed an overrepresentation of students with Specific Learning Disabilities, even when compared to a sample of their comparably-aged peers. Additionally, the Alabama Post School Outcomes Survey showed underrepresentation of students with an Intellectual Disability. The other two categories, Developmental Delay and Speech/Language Impairment, are within the +/-3.0% range of the expected values.

There were five key demographic categories that were not representative of the proposed sample: 1) gender (female 3.6% overrepresented and male 3.6% underrepresented); 2) Black (7.2% overrepresented); 3) White (8.4% underrepresented); and 4) Specific Learning Disability (21.9% overrepresented); and 5) Intellectual Disability (3.9% underrepresented). As noted above, developmental disability (3.9% underrepresented) and speech/language impairment were over the maximum acceptable variation compared to the representative sample, although when comparing the data to age-matched peers in the Child Count, these categories are not significantly different from the responding sample.

To address the deviations in representativeness of gender, Black, White, and specific learning disabilities, and intellectual disabilities categories, the ALSDE will implement the following strategies:
• Provide additional training opportunities for individuals conducting the Post-School Outcomes survey. Training will be provided through the written guidance and webinars.
• Provide technical assistance to local Special Education Coordinators regarding the need to ensure demographics are fully representative. For example, LEAs will be asked to conduct the Post School Outcomes Survey calls at varying times of day, including at least one evening attempt.
• Provide technical assistance to districts with low response rates in FFY 2015 or FFY 2016. While the ALSDE has worked diligently to improve the representation of Black or African American students in the Alabama Post School Outcomes Survey, the ALSDE acknowledges the underrepresentation of White students in the FFY 2016 results. By increasing the response rate, the ALSDE believes the deviations in representativeness will decrease.
• To address non-responders, the ALSDE will have consultants attempt to contact a sample of former students. The calls will target demographic categories lower than the maximum acceptable variation.
• Beginning in 2017, students leaving school will be asked to provide contact information, including an e-mail, when exiting. Having more than one contact will likely yield higher response rates; therefore, yield more representative demographics.
• Consider offering an online format for the survey. If approved, the option of an online format will increase access for students.
• Continue to work closely with the APEC to reach parents and former students through APEC’s outreach activities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2016 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

To address the deviations in representativeness of gender, Black, White, and specific learning disabilities, and intellectual disabilities categories, the ALSDE will implement the following strategies:

- Provide additional training opportunities for individuals conducting the Post-School Outcomes survey. Training will be provided through the written guidance and webinars.
- The ALSDE will provide technical assistance to local Special Education Coordinators regarding the need to ensure demographics are fully representative. For example, LEAs will be asked to conduct the Post School Outcomes Survey calls at varying times of day, including at least one evening attempt. Technical assistance will also be provided to districts with low response rates in FFY 2015 or FFY 2016.
- While the ALSDE has worked diligently to improve the representation of Black or African American students in the Alabama Post School Outcomes Survey, the ALSDE acknowledges the underrepresentation of White students in the FFY 2016 results. By increasing the response rate, the ALSDE believes the deviations in representativeness will decrease.

Note: Also refer to those strategies listed under "Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?"
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2005

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>46.00%</td>
<td>48.50%</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>28.72%</td>
<td>28.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>47.00%</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
<td>25.37%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>28.72%</td>
<td>16.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>29.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>34.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
<td>29.72%</td>
<td>29.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Blue – Data Update

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES Section encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.
Monitorig Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td>agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</th>
<th>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34.07%</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Reasons for Slippage

Of the 167 due process complaints filed during the reporting year (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017), 159 were filed by attorneys. Slippage shown for Indicator 15 is a result of specific legal advice provided by legal counsel to the parties. Specific legal advice is protected by client-attorney privilege and the SEA neither requests, nor is provided, information as to why the parties to the due process complaint chose not to settle at the 15-day resolution meeting. It is noted that while the number of resolution sessions resulting in agreement demonstrated slippage, the overall number of resolution sessions convened increased from 91 in FFY 2015 to 102 in FFY 2016.
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Historical Data and Targets

**Baseline Data:** 2005

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

#### Historical Data

**Baseline Data: 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>78.72%</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>87.09%</td>
<td>82.93%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>64.15%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>86.86%</td>
<td>87.11%</td>
<td>87.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The SES encouraged the active participation of stakeholders in the target-setting efforts. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to give input by reviewing available indicator data, considering historical trends, and reviewing proposed targets for each Part B Indicator. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What strikes you about the data?
2. Are the proposed targets SMART?
3. Do you support the proposed targets? If no, propose new targets with a rationale for change.

For this indicator, no changes to proposed targets were suggested by stakeholders.

---

Key:

- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/1/2017</td>
<td>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/1/2017</td>
<td>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/1/2017</td>
<td>2.1 Mediations held</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1 Mediations held</th>
<th>FFY 2015 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2016 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63.87%</td>
<td>66.86%</td>
<td>92.73%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2015 Data and FFY 2016 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2015 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Monitoring Priority: General Supervision**

**Results indicator:** The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### Reported Data

**Baseline Data: 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
<td>62.85%</td>
<td>63.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>62.35%</td>
<td>65.71%</td>
<td>70.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>63.35%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** Blue – Data Update

### Description of Measure

- 

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- 

### Overview

- 

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.
Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.
## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Data and Overview**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

**Results indicator:** The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.
**Monitoring Priority: General Supervision**

**Results indicator:** The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Theory of Action**

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)
**Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

**Data and Overview**

**Monitoring Priority: General Supervision**

**Results indicator:** The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

---

### Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

---

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

---

### Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State’s progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

---

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.
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