

AL Part B

FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

138

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).

Reporting on Data Processes and Results

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

To the maximum extent possible, data used in the APR are data that have been previously reported to the U.S. Department of Education and/or other federal agencies. Data for each indicator have been reviewed by Information Systems, the SES data manager, program specialists, and other agency staff, as appropriate.

To ensure the data systems used for official reporting purposes by the ALSDE and LEAs are valid, error-free, and accurate, the state has multi-level validations in place. These include school- and system-level validations, state-level collection processes, and state-level validation processes. The ALSDE has implemented a District Approved process for ensuring timely, complete and accurate data submissions for reporting purposes.

The ALSDE provides LEAs with data analysis and planning tools (e.g., LEA Performance Profile, LEA-At-A-Glance) to examine regional and local data. The goal is to assist LEAs to identify barriers to improve performance on all indicators and to support sustained improvement. The ALSDE convenes on-going training and work sessions for special education coordinators designed to sharpen the skills of data analysis and data-driven decision-making related to the interaction and linkages among the SPP/APR indicators by emphasizing the integrated nature of the indicators. These sessions are designed to deepen the understanding of the influences and contributing factors that related indicators exert upon the improvement of outcomes and results for students with disabilities.

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 Comprehensive Monitoring: Continuous Improvement Process. The monitoring 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 (e.g., focused monitoring) to encourage and support 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 monitoring process consists of a Self-Assessment; Desk Audit; On-Site Monitoring; High Risk Assessment and Enhanced Self-Monitoring; 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, Professional Learning 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 website, 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 corrective actions that may result from the findings. These staff members schedule contracted trained mediators and impartial due process hearing officers on a random rotation basis. The AAC details the state policy and procedures for the formal dispute resolution processes at 290-8-9.08(9) (a)—290-8-9.08(9)(c)17.(v)(V). Trainings are conducted on an ongoing basis for Dispute Resolution state staff, contracted mediators, and impartial due process hearing officers as well as during their attendance at national and state meetings (e.g., LRP Conferences, Alabama Council of Administrators in

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Special Education (CASE) Fall Legal Conference). These trainings ensure that personnel have access to the most timely and relevant information regarding the IDEA regulations, as well as relevant case law and guiding legal precedents to inform decisions. In addition, state staff utilize the resources available through the National Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) Web site, webinars, and conference calls.

The dispute resolution data for specific LEAs are reviewed to determine whether patterns or trends exist within written state complaints and 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.

Facilitated IEPs: This process is an early dispute resolution process and 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.

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 SES Fiscal Management Section works closely with the SES Monitoring Section, the SES Data 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.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place 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.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

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. Training and PD regarding low incidence disability areas, behavioral management, and the autism spectrum disorders are provided by content specific specialists.

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., Dughman 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.

Attachments			

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Stakeholder Involvement: 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 Special Education Advisory Panel (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 Services Program Coordinator, the Office of Student Learning Unit Coordinator, the Division of Instruction Director, 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

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The indicator data of the draft FFY 2017 SPP/APR were presented to the SEAP and draft provided in January 2019 for review. Specifically, stakeholders were encouraged to provide input on revised state targets.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(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 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

The SPP/APR is shared with the public and media primarily via the ALSDE's website. The FFY 2017 SPP/APR 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.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SIMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SIMR data.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			31.60%	33.60%		90.00%	90.00%		53.70%	57.60%	61.40%
Data		29.60%	32.54%	29.90%	61.00%	61.00%	62.90%	29.70%	53.79%	76.94%	64.40%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	65.30%	69.20%
Data	72.39%	54.05%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	55.82%	57.59%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

New targets were established with broad stakeholder input due to the submission of a new ESSA plan.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2016 Stakeholder Input

For the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, the ALSDE involved multiple stakeholder groups to establish ambitious long-term goals with measurements of interim progress for all students and subgroups, including children with disabilities. The long-term goal established by the ALSDE and stakeholders is to decrease the percentage of non-graduating students by 50% by year 2030. This is calculated by identifying the FFY 2016 (using school year 2015-2016 data) baseline four-year cohort graduation rate, then subtracting the graduation rate from 100 to determine the percent of non-graduates. The percent of non-graduates will be divided by two to obtain the improvement needed. The improvement needed will then be added to the baseline four-year cohort graduation rate to determine the long-term goal. This methodology will be utilized to determine the long-term goal for the all students and each applicable accountability subgroup, which includes children with disabilities.

FFY 2017 Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE communicated the projected targets for this indicator to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) members in order to gauge stakeholder support and to elicit input toward any changes that needed to be made with the ongoing indicator targets. SEAP members affirmed support for Alabama's projected targets, which reflect the approved ESSA targets for this indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	null	3367
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	null	5,025

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table		Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

The prepopulation file that was used to load the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the children with disabilities (IDEA) subgroup data, which was pulled from EDFacts on 10/1/18, did not include data for Alabama. The guidance provided by OSEP Support was to enter data in the Overwrite Data fields. The counts for the first field (number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma) are 6491; the counts for the second field (number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate) are 8765.

Clarification Explanation

The following explanation was provided by one of the ALSDE's Assistant State Superintendents: The business rules developed for the updated Cohort Portal resulted in the portal including all special education students (active and inactive special education students) in the special education subgroup. Consequently, the Special Education subgroup in the 2017 Cohort included 3585 former special education students who were no longer active special education students. The ALSDE has corrected the business rule utilized and is submitting an update that includes the data for only special education students that had active IEPs at the time of graduation. The updated counts for the first field (number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma) are 3367; the updated counts for the second field (number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate) are 5025.

It should be noted that the ALSDE is transitioning to a new vendor/student information system and does not anticipate this anomaly to occur in future submissions.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
3,367	5,025	54.05%	55.82%	67.00%

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

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

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.15%	3.90%	3.95%	3.95%	3.45%	3.45%	3.45%	12.71%	12.46%
Data		4.40%	2.60%	3.17%	3.62%	2.43%	3.30%	1.90%	1.10%	12.71%	10.75%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	12.21%	11.96%
Data	6.99%	6.85%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	11.71%	11.46%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,324	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	767	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	131	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	270	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	25	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
270	4,517	6.85%	11.71%	5.98%

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

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			99.00%	99.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	95.00%	95.50%
			Data		99.30%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	98.64%	99.41%	99.69%	95.28%	99.84%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			99.00%	99.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	95.00%	95.50%
			Data		99.30%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	98.53%	99.14%	99.54%	95.29%	99.87%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	96.00%	97.00%
		Data	98.18%	97.91%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	96.00%	97.00%
		Data	100%	97.84%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.00%	99.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	98.00%	99.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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.

Specifically, the ALSDE communicated the established targets for this indicator to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) members in order to gauge stakeholder support and to elicit input toward any changes that needed to be made with the ongoing indicator targets. SEAP members affirmed support for Alabama’s projected targets.

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	52,796	51,770	97.91%	98.00%	98.06%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	52,795	51,783	97.84%	98.00%	98.08%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Public Reporting Information

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2017	Target ≥										16.30%	23.30%
			Data										48.67%	15.68%
Math	A Overall	2017	Target ≥										17.40%	24.30%
			Data										47.25%	17.64%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	30.30%	37.20%
		Data	10.37%	12.48%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	31.20%	38.10%
		Data	15.49%	16.45%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	44.20%	51.20%
Math	A ≥ Overall	44.90%	51.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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.

Specifically, the ALSDE communicated the targets for this indicator to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) members in order to gauge stakeholder support and to elicit input toward any changes that needed to be made with the ongoing indicator targets. SEAP members affirmed support for Alabama's established targets. One commenter expressed concern regarding the rigor of the established targets and noted that the ALSDE needed to be aware of the need for programming consistent with the increased rigor in order to meet the indicator targets in coming years. The ALSDE will continue to emphasize high quality educational practices and provide assistance to LEAs to meet these rigorous, yet achievable, targets.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 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 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	8732	8662	8271	7473	6938	6672	n	n	n	n	5021

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1284	1095	830	771	583	454					300
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	104	133	145	139	75	62					n
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	239	312	259	319	283	250					298

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	8735	8663	8272	7478	6952	6671	n	n	n	n	5012
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1876	1245	826	690	469	424					342
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	356	280	235	159	95	91					n
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	312	315	274	249	268	247					167

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	51,769	7,935	12.48%	44.20%	15.33%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	51,783	8,920	16.45%	44.90%	17.23%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

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

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			11.00%	8.00%	13.00%	10.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	7.50%	6.75%
Data		14.00%	13.00%	6.87%	6.87%	6.06%	2.30%	4.55%	6.06%	3.73%	3.70%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	6.00%	5.75%
Data	3.68%	2.19%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.50%	5.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1	137	2.19%	5.50%	0.73%

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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 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.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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 the one LEA 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. Noncompliance was not identified as a result of the review.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

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: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0.78%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

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

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1	0	137	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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 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 2017 (using 2016-2017 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 one LEA was 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. For that one LEA determined to have a significant discrepancy, it was determined that the LEA did not have policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and the one LEA complied with the requirements.

% of Districts with Significant Discrepancy:

- All racial/ethnic groups = 0.73% (1 of 137)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- American Indian or Alaska Native = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- Asian = 0.00% (0 of 137)
- Black or African American = 0.73% (1 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)

Actions required in FFY 2016 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.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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 the one LEA 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. Noncompliance was not identified as a result of the review.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)**

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

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			68.05%	75.06%	60.26%	61.26%	62.26%	62.26%	62.26%	65.00%	67.50%
		Data		67.05%	74.06%	79.42%	80.98%	82.30%	82.95%	83.51%	84.82%	83.83%	83.63%
B	2005	Target ≤			6.51%	6.02%	6.90%	6.12%	6.70%	6.70%	6.70%	6.80%	6.80%
		Data		6.61%	6.12%	6.06%	5.98%	6.80%	6.19%	6.35%	6.68%	6.79%	7.00%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.77%	2.65%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.75%	2.70%
		Data		2.77%	2.75%	2.67%	2.80%	2.62%	2.66%	2.73%	1.56%	2.73%	2.63%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	69.75%	72.25%
	Data	83.56%	83.52%
B	Target ≤	6.50%	6.25%
	Data	7.19%	7.16%
C	Target ≤	2.65%	2.60%
	Data	2.49%	2.45%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	75.00%	77.75%
Target B ≤	6.25%	6.00%
Target C ≤	2.55%	2.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	82,492	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	69,007	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,961	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,106	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	700	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	261	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	69,007	82,492	83.52%	75.00%	83.65%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5,961	82,492	7.16%	6.25%	7.23%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,067	82,492	2.45%	2.55%	2.51%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2013	Target ≥									52.50%	46.71%	47.00%
		Data								52.50%	49.83%	46.71%	49.43%
B	2011	Target ≤									6.58%	6.50%	6.30%
		Data								6.58%	5.68%	5.94%	5.08%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	47.50%	47.75%
	Data	50.58%	50.91%
B	Target ≤	6.10%	5.90%
	Data	3.80%	3.57%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	49.00%	53.00%
Target B ≤	5.70%	5.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	7,827	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	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	4,113	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	143	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	49	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	9	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early	4,113	7,827	50.91%	49.00%	52.55%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	201	7,827	3.57%	5.70%	2.57%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						84.70%	85.80%	85.80%		90.30%	90.55%
		Data					85.50%	87.00%	88.10%	90.80%	91.70%	90.31%	91.23%
A2	2008	Target ≥						59.30%	60.70%	60.70%		82.25%	82.55%
		Data					59.60%	61.50%	61.90%	65.70%	76.10%	82.26%	82.38%
B1	2008	Target ≥						79.70%	80.80%	80.80%		90.15%	90.45%
		Data					80.60%	80.90%	83.20%	86.70%	91.30%	90.16%	90.59%
B2	2008	Target ≥						29.00%	32.40%	32.40%		64.55%	64.85%
		Data					29.20%	31.80%	34.90%	42.50%	56.50%	64.59%	65.65%
C1	2008	Target ≥						84.70%	85.20%	85.20%		88.60%	88.85%
		Data					85.10%	86.80%	87.00%	90.00%	90.60%	88.60%	90.60%
C2	2008	Target ≥						71.80%	72.30%	72.30%		87.70%	87.95%
		Data					72.20%	74.70%	74.30%	76.50%	83.30%	87.72%	87.83%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	90.80%	91.05%
	Data	91.77%	91.50%
A2	Target ≥	82.80%	83.05%
	Data	80.40%	80.91%
B1	Target ≥	90.70%	90.95%
	Data	91.25%	91.44%
B2	Target ≥	65.10%	65.35%
	Data	64.45%	64.45%
C1	Target ≥	89.10%	89.35%
	Data	89.48%	91.30%
C2	Target ≥	88.20%	88.45%
	Data	86.96%	88.08%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	91.30%	91.55%
Target A2 ≥	83.30%	83.55%
Target B1 ≥	91.20%	91.45%
Target B2 ≥	65.60%	65.85%
Target C1 ≥	89.60%	89.85%
Target C2 ≥	88.70%	88.95%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	2,795
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13	0.47%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	110	3.94%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	467	16.71%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,205	43.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,000	35.78%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1672.00	1795.00	91.50%	91.30%	93.15%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2205.00	2795.00	80.91%	83.30%	78.89%

Reasons for A2 Slippage

The ALSDE recognizes slippage within Indicator 7A2, the percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A (positive social-emotional skills including social relationships) by the time they turned six years of age or exited program. The ALSDE continues to analyze the data to discern the contributing factors associated with the slippage in this indicator. A potential contributing factor include extensive staff turn-over within many school districts in the State, resulting in less experienced personnel conducting the ELPP assessment and ratings. In order to address this issue, the ALSDE is ensuring that all staff in the districts are trained in the administration of entry and exit ELPP.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	8	0.29%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	161	5.76%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	838	29.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,286	46.01%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	502	17.96%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2124.00	2293.00	91.44%	91.20%	92.63%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1788.00	2795.00	64.45%	65.60%	63.97%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13	0.47%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	113	4.04%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	267	9.55%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	966	34.56%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,436	51.38%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1233.00	1359.00	91.30%	89.60%	90.73%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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)	2402.00	2795.00	88.08%	88.70%	85.94%

Reasons for C2 Slippage

The ALSDE recognizes slippage within Indicator 7C2, the percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C (use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs) by the time they turned six years of age or exited program. The ALSDE continues to analyze the data to discern the contributing factors associated with the 7C2 slippage. A potential contributing factor includes extensive staff turn-over within many school districts in the State, resulting in less experienced personnel conducting the ELPP assessment and ratings. In order to address this issue, the ALSDE is ensuring that all staff in the districts are trained in the administration of entry and exit ELPP. Additionally, the ALSDE will drill down into the LEA data and, with the input of the LEA staff, determine other contributing factors in the FFY 17 slippage for this indicator.

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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

--

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			88.30%	88.50%	88.70%	88.90%	74.90%	75.00%	75.00%	75.13%	75.38%
Data			86.80%	87.50%	84.20%	74.50%	74.90%	73.20%	73.70%	75.13%	67.05%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	75.63%	75.88%
Data	76.54%	80.74%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	76.13%	76.38%

Key:

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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
FFY 2017 SPP/APR

During the FFY 2017 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. Parents of transition-aged children also provided on the Indicators of Family Engagement Survey.
- 6) Offering state-level training events throughout the year, including three regional Transition Summit events for parents, professionals, and educators.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
5,047	6,469	80.74%	76.13%	78.02%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	24.55%	26345.00
---	--------	----------

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 (a); response rate

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

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 2017 Indicator 8 Parent Involvement data represent the third year of a new four-year cohort; it is the first year for this particular cohort. 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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

The sampling includes 22 index categories:

- Gender (Male, Female);
- Race/Ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, White, Multiple Race)
- Primary Disability (Autism, Deaf-Blindness, Developmental Delay, Emotional Disability, Hearing Impairment, Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, Speech/Language Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury, Visual Impairment)

The responding sample is compared to 2017 Child Count data for the participating cohort districts. Differences between the responding sample and the population are compared for these 22 categories.

According to LaPier, Bullis and Falls (September 2007), responses +/-3.0% are considered "important differences" for sampling. The ALSDE has adopted this standard for representativeness.

School districts within the selected annual cohorts are charged with disseminating the state-developed Alabama Parent Survey to all parents of students with IEPs ages 3-21 within the district. Districts offer the survey in two formats: 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 Alabama State Department of Education 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 5% of the surveys. 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

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

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

There were eight indices that were +/-3.0% of the target sample and therefore not representative:

- Black (10.4% underrepresented);
- White (7.7% overrepresented);
- Multiple Race (3.1% overrepresented);
- Autism (4.0% overrepresented);
- Developmental Delay (3.1% overrepresented);
- Other Health Impairment (4.6% underrepresented);
- Specific Learning Disability (5.6% underrepresented); and
- Speech/Language Impairment (3.13% overrepresented).

The indices for Multiple Race, Autism, and Specific Learning Disability were also not representative in FFY 2016, although the differences decreased for FFY 2017.

To address the deviations in representativeness of future Indicator 8 samples, the ALSDE will implement the following strategies:

- The ALSDE will review the sampling procedures to ensure the FFY 2017 cohort is representative of the state.
- The ALSDE will provide technical assistance to local Special Education Coordinators as part of the monthly conference calls regarding the need to ensure demographics are fully representative.
- Districts with response rates below 16% will receive technical assistance to determine strategies for increasing response rates.
- The ALSDE will continue to work closely with the Alabama Parent Education Center to reach parents through APEC's outreach activities. The ALSDE will ask APEC to include the weblink to the survey on its monthly newsletters.
- The ALSDE will be in communication with specific advocacy groups around the state, particularly those addressing parents of students with specific learning disabilities and ADHD.
- In an effort to promote the online survey, the state will share the weblink to the survey on the Special Education Services page, as well as at statewide conferences with parent participants.
- Districts with higher response rates may be asked to share their strategies either on webinars or newsletters.

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 Alabama Parent Survey had a response rate of 24.55% for FFY 2017. The number of parents who received the Alabama Parent Survey is based on the 8/6/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2017 Child Count data for participating districts.

The FFY 2017 demographic data of the responding parent sample were compared with the 2017 Child Count data for the same school districts. Comparisons were made for 22 indices in the categories of gender, ethnicity, and disability type. Difference scores were calculated to determine whether the students responding to the AL Parent Survey are representative of the population.

Representativeness of 2017 Responding Sample Compared to the Population of Students with IEPs in the Same School Districts

Sample Indices	FFY 2017 District Population	FFY 2017 Responding Sample	Difference: Responding Sample v. Population
GENDER			
Female	32.56%	34.80%	2.24%
Male	67.44%	65.20%	-2.24%
ETHNICITY			
Asian	0.47%	0.37%	-0.10%
Black	41.94%	31.54%	-10.40%
Hispanic	5.19%	5.15%	-0.04%
Native American	0.80%	0.60%	-0.20%
Pacific Islander	0.07%	0.06%	-0.01%
White	49.88%	57.53%	7.65%
Multiple Race	1.64%	4.74%	3.10%
DISABILITY			
Autism	6.82%	10.78%	3.96%
Deaf/Blindness	0.01%	0.25%	0.24%
Developmental Delay	6.04%	9.11%	3.07%
Emotional Disability	1.04%	1.24%	0.20%
Hearing Impairment	0.93%	0.59%	-0.34%
Intellectual Disability	8.39%	6.07%	-2.32%
Multiple Disabilities	1.25%	3.36%	2.11%
Orthopedic Impairment	0.60%	0.41%	-0.19%
Other Health Impairment	12.67%	8.10%	-4.57%
Specific Learning Disability	41.25%	35.70%	-5.55%
Speech/Language Impairment	20.15%	23.28%	3.13%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.24%	0.50%	0.26%
Visual Impairment	0.47%	0.62%	0.15%

Responses +/-3.0% were considered “important differences” and bolded in the “Differences” column in the table above. The indices that were over- or underrepresented among the 2017 sample were:

- Black (-10.4%, under)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- White (7.7%, over)
- Multiple Race (3.1%, over)
- Autism (4.0%, over)
- Developmental Delay (3.1%, over)
- Other Health Impairment (-4.6%, under)
- Specific Learning Disability (-5.6%, under)
- Speech/Language Impairment (3.13% over)

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		2.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

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. 129

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
9	0	9	0%	0%	0%

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 the risk ratio, and if necessary the alternate risk ratio, to calculate disproportionate representation for racial and ethnic groups. In its definition, disproportionate representation is defined in terms of overrepresentation where an LEA is considered to have disproportionate representation for Indicator 9 when the risk ratio (RR) is greater than 2.25 with more than ten students in each racial and ethnic group. 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 138 LEAs were included in the calculation of disproportionate representation.

Based on the data for all 138 LEAs, 119 LEAs had a RR of less than 2.25 and showed no disproportionality; whereas, 19 LEAs had a RR greater than 2.25 and showed disproportionality. Of the 19 LEAs that showed disproportionality, **nine** LEAs had more than ten students in a racial/ethnic group and met the minimum n and/or cell size of ten; ten LEAs did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size of ten for each of the seven racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, the ALSDE excluded 129 LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation due to each LEA not having met the minimum n and/or cell size and determined that **nine** LEAs were identified as having met the minimum n and/or cell size of ten and, thus, met the state's criteria for and determined to have disproportionality.

Step Two

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In determining if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as part of the data review, the ALSDE reviewed the nine 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, 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 are reviewed (modified as necessary) 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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2019, when calculating the number of districts that met the minimum cell size, the State must exclude from the calculation not only the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size, but the total number of the districts in the State (those identified with disproportionate representation and those not identified) that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size.

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.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

In response to actions required in FFY 2016, the data were recalculated to exclude not only the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size, but the total number of districts in the state (those identified with disproportionate representation and those not identified) that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. Based on the FFY 2016 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, showed disproportionality, and did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size of ten. Of the ten LEAs that showed disproportionality, **six** LEAs had more than ten students in a racial/ethnic group and met the minimum n and/or cell size of ten; four LEAs did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size of ten for each of the seven racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, the ALSDE excluded **131** LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation due to each LEA not having met the minimum n and/or cell size and determined that **six** LEAs were identified as having met the minimum n and/or cell size of ten and, thus, met the state's criteria for and determined to have disproportionality.

Summary of Recalculated FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data:

- 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 = 131
- Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services = 6
- Number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size = 6

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

OSEP Response

OSEP notes that there is a discrepancy in what the State reported as "the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size". Specifically, when reporting on the number of districts that it excluded due to the minimum n and/or cell size, the State included both the districts that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size and the districts with a risk ratio of less than 2.25 that did not have disproportionate representation, regardless of whether or not they met the n size.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		2.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

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. 76

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
62	0	62	0%	0%	0%

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 and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The ALSDE uses the risk ratio, and if necessary the alternate risk ratio, to calculate disproportionate representation for racial and ethnic groups. In its definition, disproportionate representation is defined in terms of overrepresentation where an LEA is considered to have disproportionate representation for Indicator 10 when the risk ratio (RR) is greater than 2.50 with more than ten students in each racial and ethnic group. 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 138 LEAs were included in the calculation of disproportionate representation.

Based on the data for all 138 LEAs, ten LEAs had a RR of less than 2.50 and showed no disproportionality in all racial/ethnic groups and in all disability categories; whereas, 128 LEAs had a RR of greater than 2.50 and showed disproportionality in at least one racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories. Of the 128 LEAs that showed disproportionality (i.e., had a RR greater than 2.50) in at least one racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories, 66 LEAs had less than or equal to ten students for each of the seven racial and ethnic groups and did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size of ten and 62 LEAs had more than ten students in a racial/ethnic group and did meet the minimum n and/or cell size of ten.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Therefore, the ALSDE excluded 76 LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation due to each LEA not having met the minimum cell size and determined that 62 LEAs were identified as having met the minimum cell 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 = 7.25% (10 of 138) were overrepresented for White students.
- Emotional Disability = 0.72% (1 of 138) were overrepresented for White students; 2.17% (3 of 138) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Intellectual Disability = 2.17% (3 of 138) were overrepresented for White students; 17.39% (24 of 138) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Other Health Impairment = 3.62% (5 of 138) were overrepresented for White students; 5.80% (8 of 138) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Specific Learning Disability = 8.70% (12 of 138) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.
- Speech or Language Impairment = 9.42% (13 of 138) were overrepresented for White students; 0.72% (1 of 138) were overrepresented for Black or African American students.

Step Two

In determining if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as part of the data review, the ALSDE reviewed the 62 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, 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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2019, when calculating the number of districts that meet the minimum n and/or cell size, the State must exclude from the calculation not only the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that did not meet the minimum cell and/or n size, but the total number of the districts in the State (those identified with disproportionate representation and those not identified) that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size.

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.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

In response to actions required in FFY 2016, the data were recalculated to exclude not only the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size, but the total number of districts in the state (those identified with disproportionate representation and those not identified) that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. Based on the FFY 2016 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, 46 LEAs had

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

more than ten students in a racial/ethnic group and met the minimum n and/or cell size of ten; 68 LEAs had ten or fewer students in a racial/ethnic group and did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size of ten. Therefore, the ALSDE excluded 91 LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation due to each LEA not having met the minimum n and/or cell size and determined that 46 LEAs were identified as having met the minimum n and/or cell size of ten and, thus, met the state's criteria for and determined to have disproportionality.

Summary of Recalculated FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data:

- 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 = 91
- Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in special education and related services = 46
- Number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size = 46

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

OSEP Response

OSEP notes that there is a discrepancy in what the State reported as "the number of dsitricts totally excluded from the calculation because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size". Specifically, when reporting on the number of districts that it excluded due to the minimum n and/or cell size, the State included both the districts that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size and the districts with a risk ratio of less than 2.25 that did not have disporportionate representation, regardless of whether or not they met the n size.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		82.00%	84.13%	94.40%	97.90%	99.20%	99.70%	99.70%	99.70%	99.70%	99.36%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.51%	99.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
23,342	23,289	99.68%	100%	99.77%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	53
---	----

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 53, the following numbers indicate the range of days beyond the 60-day initial evaluation timeline when evaluations were completed for children: 1-15 days - 24; 16-30 days - 15; 31-45 days - 1; 46-60 days - 2; and 60+ days - 11. 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 8/6/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
29	29	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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 all LEAs identified as having noncompliance were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The ALSDE reports database was accessed to view each LEAs 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 LEAs identified as having noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2016 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.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		76.30%	94.07%	97.88%	100%	99.80%	100%	99.64%	99.56%	98.50%	99.72%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.86%	99.65%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,520
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	256
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,157
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.	73
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	32
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.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	1,157	1,159	99.65%	100%	99.83%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	2
--	---

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Given that the number of children in (a) but not included in b, c, d or e is 2, the following numbers indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed: 1-15 Days - 0; 16-30 Days - 1; 31-45 Days - 0; 46-60 Days - 0; and 60+ Days - 1. The reasons for delays for both instances (2) 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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2016 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 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 2016 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 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 2016 was corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and no instance of noncompliance remains uncorrected from previous years.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

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

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						99.93%	99.87%	99.91%	100%	99.98%	99.97%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.99%	99.91%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
20,155	20,202	99.91%	100%	99.77%

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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2016 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 LEAs 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 2016 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 2016, 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.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							13.90%	13.90%	13.90%	22.24%	22.49%
		Data						13.77%	14.12%	19.60%	24.90%	22.24%	25.38%
B	2009	Target ≥							45.60%	45.60%	45.60%	62.35%	62.60%
		Data						45.41%	42.78%	40.20%	60.70%	62.35%	65.71%
C	2009	Target ≥							63.80%	63.80%	63.80%	76.36%	76.61%
		Data						63.48%	53.86%	45.50%	68.80%	76.36%	74.29%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	22.74%	22.99%
	Data	27.33%	27.81%
B	Target ≥	62.85%	63.10%
	Data	70.20%	60.20%
C	Target ≥	76.86%	77.11%
	Data	78.49%	68.85%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	23.24%	23.49%
Target B ≥	63.35%	63.60%
Target C ≥	77.36%	77.61%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2013 SPP/APR

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.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR

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

During the FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, the ALSDE sought input from stakeholders on how the ALSDE can assist the LEAs in making transition

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 evidenc-based resource). In addition, the ALSDE has received targeted technical assistance from NTACTION 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.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR

During the FFY 2017 year, 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. During the parent focus groups, participants received training on the Alabama Engage Series Parent Handbook to assist parents with students of transition-aged children with planning for post-school life.

2) Testing and developing the statewide Engage Alabama app for students with disabilities to encourage participation in their IEP planning and meetings.

3) Offering state-level transition training events throughout the year, including transition topics at the Summer Professional Learning Conference; and three regional Transition Summit events for parents, professionals, and educators.

4) Meeting with a Family Transition Stakeholder Group throughout the year. As a continuation of the prior year’s activities, the ALSDE met with representative partners to discuss the needs around transition and post-school services.

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. Additionally, AL SPDG parents of students of transition age were also asked complete an Indicators of Family Engagement Tool (Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant, 2009) and the SSIP-developed Planning for Life After School survey. These surveys were used to determine areas to focus at training sessions.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1183.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	312.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	398.00
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)	30.00
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).	94.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	312.00	1183.00	27.81%	23.24%	26.37%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	710.00	1183.00	60.20%	63.35%	60.02%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	834.00	1183.00	68.85%	77.36%	70.50%

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.

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 ALSDE uses a representative sample of students with IEPs one-year after leaving high school. The FFY 2017 Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes data represent the third year of a new two-year cohort, and therefore it is the second reporting of 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, 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. Two 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 two 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, 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 index’s percentages on the sample group percentages.

The sampling includes 22 index categories:

- Gender (Male, Female);
- Race/Ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, White, Multiple Race)
- Primary Disability (Autism, Deaf-Blindness, Developmental Delay, Emotional Disability, Hearing Impairment, Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, Speech/Language Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury, Visual Impairment)

The responding sample is compared to the population of students with IEPs one-year post-school for these 22 categories. According to LaPier, Bullis and Falls (September 2007), the former National Post-School Outcomes Center indicated those responses +/-3.0% are considered “important differences.” The ALSDE has adopted this standard for representativeness.

Was a survey used? Yes
Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The state’s Alabama Post School Outcome Survey response rate was 63.40%.

The FFY 2017 responding sample was compared to the target leaver group within the same districts. A comparison of groups showed the responding sample was within +/-3.0% of the population for all index categories.

In prior years, the ALSDE has had over-/underrepresentation in disability subgroups, however in FFY 2017, the difference between the sample and target groups ranged from 0 to 1.18%. Likewise, differences for gender and race/ethnicity categories were within the +/-3.0% standard.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				48.00%	48.50%	49.00%	49.50%	49.50%	49.50%	28.72%	28.97%
Data		47.00%	17.74%	25.37%	75.00%	60.00%	17.14%	16.18%	10.94%	28.72%	18.68%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	29.22%	29.47%
Data	34.07%	17.65%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	29.72%	29.97%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	25	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	90	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
25	90	17.65%	29.72%	27.78%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

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

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			65.00%	67.50%	70.00%	72.50%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	86.11%	86.36%
Data		62.50%	78.72%	67.00%	87.09%	82.93%	84.62%	64.15%	80.56%	86.11%	89.74%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	86.61%	86.86%
Data	83.87%	92.73%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	87.11%	87.36%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	14	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	31	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	49	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
14	31	49	92.73%	87.11%	91.84%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

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

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		62.60%	62.85%	63.10%	63.35%
Data	62.35%	65.71%	70.20%	60.20%	60.02%

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

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	63.60%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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.

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).

Statement

[Empty text box]

Description

[Empty text box]

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.

[Empty text box]

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)

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.

[Empty text box]

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.

[Empty text box]

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.

[Empty text box]

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.

[Empty text box]

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Crystal Richardson

Title: Coorinator, Special Education Services

Email: crystalr@alsde.edu

Phone: 334-694-4782