

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part B**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019)  
ALABAMA**



**PART B DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

139

#### General Supervision System

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

##### State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) focuses on a balance between compliance and improving results for children and youths with individualized education programs (IEPs). 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 website 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 website; 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

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.

##### 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. 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 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.

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

The ALSDE has developed a long-term plan that uses the SPP/APR indicators as a system of improvement 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.

##### Effective System of Dispute Resolution

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 system of dispute resolutions includes processes such as facilitated IEPs, mediations, complaints, and impartial due process hearings.

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.

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.

##### Responsible Fiscal Management System

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 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

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.

#### **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 ALSDE, SES Section recognizes that a process for delivering technical assistance (TA) to districts, families, and other agencies is an integral component of an effective system of general supervision. The SES Section has developed a process for delivering TA that is directly linked with other components of its general supervision system, including the SPP/APR indicators, to improve both compliance and results. The TA structure is designed according to three types: general, targeted, and intensive. Moreover, the TA process consists of several delivery options, including on-site, teleconferences, webinars, and through electronic means, such as Podcasts and Moodle.

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

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

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

#### **Professional Development System**

##### **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.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement**

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

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

##### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

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

Both the SPP/APR and LEA Performance Profiles are posted no later than 120 days following the State's APR submission on the OSEP required submission date, generally on February 1st.

## Intro - Prior FFY 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.

## Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Pursuant to a State's Determination of Needs Assistance for two-consecutive years (i.e., FFY 2016 and FFY 2017), the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE), the Special Education Services (SES) Section has included the technical assistance and resources accessed below.

### AREA: Improving Data Quality and Reporting

Technical assistance (TA) received regarding the Success Gaps White Paper and Rubric as presented by the IDEA Data Center (IDC) at the Results Driven Accountability Leadership Series. The Success Gaps White Paper and Rubric was used to assist a local education agency (LEA) identified for coordinated early intervening services (CEIS). The ALSDE also participated on webinars hosted by the Center on Integrating IDEA Data (CIID).

### AREA: Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

Information regarding the SSIP - The ALSDE has accessed TA from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) for the SSIP Phases I, II and III. Specifically, technical assistance was sought and provided regarding stakeholder involvement and implementation science. NCSI also provided on-site technical assistance by presenting Implementation Science to stakeholders and the ALSDE staff.

### AREA: Reading and Mathematics Improvement Strategies

Resource guide document accessed from the Center on Instruction: Evidence-Based Reading and Mathematics Interventions: Intensive Interventions for Students Struggling in Reading and Mathematics. A Practice Guide (Vaughn, Sharon; Wanzek, Jeanne; Murray, Christy S.; Roberts, Greg). The ALSDE has accessed this Practice Guide for evidence-based instruction in reading and mathematics in order to improve adolescent literacy and mathematics skills. The Practice Guide continues to be used to inform interventions, especially within our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Demonstration Sites.

### Reading to Learn: Close Reading in K-12 Content Areas Archived webinar on NCSI website

Methods of reading instruction and discussion that are process rather than strategy-based. Host: Matthew Nathan; Presented by Kevin Perks, Robert Bickford, Aaron Germana. This tool continues to be disseminated to Alabama's SSIP consultants, Instructional Coaches and SES staff members to assist with informing reading instruction delivery in co-taught classes.

### AREA: Post-School Outcomes (State Identified Measurable Result)

Aligning Evidence-Based Practices and Predictors for Post-School Success is being used by the ALSDE to design and implement effective practices in secondary transition for improving students' post-school outcomes. The ALSDE continues to utilize the module on secondary transition produced by the IRIS Center at Vanderbilt University to provide transition information and resources to parents of students with disabilities. Additionally, the link has been uploaded on the ALSDE website. Teachers in targeted sites have been able to access the module and receive CEUs through an agreement with Vanderbilt University. The ALSDE is also utilizing the Transition Coalition resources as well as the IRIS module on Transition (see above).

### AREA: Dispute Resolution

The ALSDE has accessed and used resources from the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE). Specifically, the Part B Dispute Resolution Assessment has been used to review and revise state processes to maintain compliance with applicable requirements. Additional presentation materials are being reviewed as options for implementation of exemplar practices for IDEA mediations and development of alternative dispute resolution options.

### AREA: Fiscal Accountability

The ALSDE has used information from the LRP National Institute on Legal Issues of Educating Individuals with Disabilities. The information was used to ensure expenditures are allowable and limit the risk of misuse and audit findings and to gain a better understanding of the rules and considerations that must be made prior to conducting such activities as the purchase of expenditures, the procurement process, and internal controls.

The ALSDE attended the Brustein & Manasevit, PLLC Forums to gain a comprehensive understanding of the Federal Grants Reform and to assist with refinement of state internal controls. The ALSDE also has participated on TA calls with the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR). The information obtained was used to help meet federal obligations and compliance requirements.

### AREA: TA Conferences and Meetings

The ALSDE staff attended the following TA conferences/meetings in addition to regularly-scheduled OSEP and TA&D Center calls:

- 1) 2017 OSEP Leadership Conference, Washington, DC (July 2017)
- 2) Improving Data, Improving Outcomes, New Orleans, LA (DATE)
- 3) IDC Interactive Institute, Orlando, FL (February 2018)
- 4) OSEP Project Director's Conference, Arlington, VA (July 2018)
- 5) Brustein & Mansevit, PLLC Forum, New Orleans, LA (November 2018)
- 5) One-Time Coaching Series Featuring Jim Knight and Randy Sprick, Sacramento, CA (November 2018)
- 6) Brustein & Mansevit, PLLC Forum, Washington, DC (May 2019)\*
- 7) OSEP Virtual Symposia Series: Innovative Strategies and Best Practices to Attract, Prepare, and Retain Effective Personnel (April-August 2019)\*
- 8) IDC Peer to Peer Exchange: Significant Disproportionality (October 2019)\*
- 9) Brustein & Mansevit, PLLC Forum, New Orleans (December 2019)\*
- 10) LRP's Legal Issues of Educating Individuals with Disabilities, Orlando, FL (April 2019)\*

\*Indicates conferences and meetings accessed during the calendar year but outside of the FFY 2018 reporting period.

## **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it 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. The State provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17/SSIP, and OSEP accepts that target.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 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 Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (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-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

#### Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	54.05%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	57.60%	61.40%	65.30%	69.20%	55.82%
Data	76.94%	64.40%	72.39%	54.05%	67.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	57.59%	57.59%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,398
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,994
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.04%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,398	4,994	67.00%	57.59%	68.04%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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? (yes/no)**

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2013	12.71%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	12.71%	12.46%	12.21%	11.96%	11.71%
Data	12.71%	10.75%	6.99%	6.85%	5.98%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	11.46%	10.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

Based on stakeholder input, it was recommended that the target be decreased from 11.46% to 10%. The ALSDE has reviewed performance patterns and agrees with decreasing the target to 10% in light of performance patterns for this indicator.

### Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

### Prepopulated Data



Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	3,282
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	918
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	84
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	284
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	24

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
284	4,592	5.98%	11.46%	6.18%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

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

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.50%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%
A	Overall	99.30%	Actual	95.28%	99.84%	98.18%	97.91%	98.06%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.50%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%
A	Overall	99.30%	Actual	95.29%	99.87%	100.00%	97.84%	98.08%

#### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	99.00%	99.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	99.00%	99.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

#### FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	8,988	9,073	8,827	8,146	7,451	6,970					5,115
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7,246	5,923	5,469	4,845	4,778	4,607					2,054
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	955	2,346	2,518	2,441	1,863	1,492					2,046
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	676	715	737	743	670	717					656

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	8,990	9,075	8,828	8,148	7,452	6,973					5,115
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7,242	5,919	5,467	4,843	4,779	4,601					2,051
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	954	2,350	2,519	2,436	1,865	1,489					2,044
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	674	714	737	743	671	717					656

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	54,570	53,497	98.06%	99.00%	98.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	54,581	53,471	98.08%	99.00%	97.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	16.30%	23.30%	30.30%	37.20%	44.20%
A	Overall	15.33%	Actual	15.68%	10.24%	10.37%	12.48%	15.33%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	17.40%	24.30%	31.20%	38.10%	44.90%
A	Overall	17.23%	Actual	17.64%	13.79%	15.49%	16.45%	17.23%

#### Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	51.20%	51.20%
Math	A >=	Overall	51.80%	51.80%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

#### FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**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	8,877	8,984	8,724	8,029	7,311	6,816					4,756
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,397	1,130	920	682	651	526					106
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	70	153	163	161	134	86					181
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	216	314	269	341	284	216					274

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**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	8,870	8,983	8,723	8,022	7,315	6,807					4,751
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,136	1,272	922	677	559	453					135
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	186	259	233	234	125	133					190
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	272	308	275	257	232	198					128

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	53,497	8,274	15.33%	51.20%	15.47%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	53,471	9,184	17.23%	51.80%	17.18%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**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

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

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$ .

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	14.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	7.50%	6.75%	6.00%	5.75%	5.50%
Data	3.73%	3.70%	3.68%	2.19%	0.73%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	5.00%	4.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

Based on stakeholder input, it was recommended that the target be decreased from 5% to 4%. The ALSDE has reviewed performance patterns and agrees with decreasing the target to 4% in light of performance patterns for this indicator.



**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

NO

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	138	0.73%	5.00%	2.17%	Met Target	No Slippage

**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

**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.

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

Although the total number of districts is 139 as reported in the introduction for this reporting period, using school year 2017-18 data as required, the state had a total of 138 districts at that time.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 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 three LEAs that the ALSDE identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, the State reviewed the LEAs’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure 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 LEAs 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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.**

1

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	137	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 2018 (using 2017-2018 data) was 0.30%. An LEA was determined to have a significant discrepancy if its rate of suspensions/expulsions for children with IEPs was greater than 2.30%. A minimum "n" size of one was used yielding the exclusion of one LEA from the calculations due to the suspension rate greater than 2.30% with only one student suspended/expelled in a racial/ethnic group.

A total of two LEAs were determined to have a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. For the two LEAs 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 two LEAs complied with the requirements.

% of Districts with Significant Discrepancy:

All racial/ethnic groups = 2.17% (3 of 138); American Indian or Alaska Native = 0.00% (0 of 138); Asian = 0.00% (0 of 138); Black or African American = 1.45% (2 of 138); Hispanic/Latino = 0.00% (0 of 138); Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander = 0.00% (0 of 138); White = 0.00% (0 of 138); Two or more races = 0.00% (0 of 138).

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

Although the total number of districts is 139 as reported in the introduction for this reporting period, using school year 2017-18 data as required, the state had a total of 138 districts at that time.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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 two LEAs that the ALSDE identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, the State reviewed the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure 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 LEAs 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	65.00%	67.50%	69.75%	72.25%	75.00%
A	67.05%	Data	83.83%	83.63%	83.56%	83.52%	83.65%
B	2005	Target <=	6.80%	6.80%	6.50%	6.25%	6.25%
B	6.61%	Data	6.79%	7.00%	7.19%	7.16%	7.23%
C	2005	Target <=	2.75%	2.70%	2.65%	2.60%	2.55%
C	2.77%	Data	2.73%	2.63%	2.49%	2.45%	2.51%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	77.75%	77.75%
Target B <=	6.00%	6.00%
Target C <=	2.50%	2.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	85,436

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	71,419
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,136
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,121
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	682
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	290

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	71,419	85,436	83.65%	77.75%	83.59%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,136	85,436	7.23%	6.00%	7.18%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,093	85,436	2.51%	2.50%	2.45%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

### 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2013	Target >=	46.71%	47.00%	47.50%	47.75%	49.00%
A	46.71%	Data	46.71%	49.43%	50.58%	50.91%	52.55%
B	2011	Target <=	6.50%	6.30%	6.10%	5.90%	5.70%
B	6.58%	Data	5.94%	5.08%	3.80%	3.57%	2.57%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	53.00%	53.00%
Target B <=	5.50%	5.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,036

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	4,297
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	176
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	64
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	11

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,297	8,036	52.55%	53.00%	53.47%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	251	8,036	2.57%	5.50%	3.12%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

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

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**6 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	90.30%	90.55%	90.80%	91.05%	91.30%
A1	85.50%	Data	90.31%	91.23%	91.77%	91.50%	93.15%

A2	2008	Target >=	82.25%	82.55%	82.80%	83.05%	83.30%
A2	59.60%	Data	82.26%	82.38%	80.40%	80.91%	78.89%
B1	2008	Target >=	90.15%	90.45%	90.70%	90.95%	91.20%
B1	80.60%	Data	90.16%	90.59%	91.25%	91.44%	92.63%
B2	2008	Target >=	64.55%	64.85%	65.10%	65.35%	65.60%
B2	29.20%	Data	64.59%	65.65%	64.45%	64.45%	63.97%
C1	2008	Target >=	88.60%	88.85%	89.10%	89.35%	89.60%
C1	85.10%	Data	88.60%	90.60%	89.48%	91.30%	90.73%
C2	2008	Target >=	87.70%	87.95%	88.20%	88.45%	88.70%
C2	72.20%	Data	87.72%	87.83%	86.96%	88.08%	85.94%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	91.55%	91.55%
Target A2 >=	83.55%	83.55%
Target B1 >=	91.45%	91.45%
Target B2 >=	65.85%	65.85%
Target C1 >=	89.85%	89.85%
Target C2 >=	88.95%	88.95%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

#### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,796

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	12	0.43%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	93	3.33%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	504	18.03%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,224	43.78%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	963	34.44%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A,	1,728	1,833	93.15%	91.55%	94.27%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,187	2,796	78.89%	83.55%	78.22%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**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	6	0.21%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	174	6.22%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	839	30.01%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,360	48.64%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	417	14.91%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,199	2,379	92.63%	91.45%	92.43%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,777	2,796	63.97%	65.85%	63.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	10	0.36%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	96	3.43%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	281	10.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,040	37.20%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,369	48.96%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.	1,321	1,427	90.73%	89.85%	92.57%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	2,409	2,796	85.94%	88.95%	86.16%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**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/no)**

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**If 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.

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 7 - Required Actions

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

Based on stakeholder input, it was recommended that families have an opportunity to complete surveys annually regarding their opportunity for training and involvement. The ALSDE plans to conduct parent surveys during the FFY 2019 reporting period using a census rather than a sample methodology to get a baseline and reconfigure the sample in accordance with the population demographics.

During the FFY 2018 year, the ALSDE has sought input on how to increase parent involvement to better improve services for students with disabilities. Strategies for seeking input included:

- 1) Gathering input from parents and participants on the Alabama Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).
- 2) Partnering with the Alabama Parent Education Center (APEC) on several initiatives, including training, transition parent focus groups, and resources for parents.
- 3) Brainstorming ideas with parents during parent focus groups on actions for teachers, schools, and districts to take to improve family collaboration and supports.
- 4) 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 completed the Family Engagement Tool (Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant, 2009) and the SSIP-developed Planning for Life After School survey.
- 5) Offering state-level training events throughout the year, including two regional ENGAGE AL events for parents, professionals, and educators.

### Historical Data

Baseline	2010	74.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	75.13%	75.38%	75.63%	75.88%	76.13%

Data	75.13%	67.05%	76.54%	80.74%	78.02%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	76.38%	76.38%

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,579	7,274	78.02%	76.38%	76.70%	Met Target	No Slippage

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

31,695

**Percentage of respondent parents**

22.95%

**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.**

The Alabama Parent Survey was designed for all parents of students with disabilities ages 3-21 rate the facilitation of parent involvement at their children’s schools. Teachers and school staff collect surveys from parents of both preschool and school-age children. Since one survey is administered to both groups and the data collection process is the same, no additional steps were taken when combining the data. The data from parents of preschool and school-age children are reported in aggregate.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If 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 2018 Indicator 8 Parent Involvement data represent the fourth 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, 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 were stratified into two groups, based on their student enrollment. Following OSEP’s interpretation, the first group was comprised of the largest districts with an average daily membership (ADM) of 50,000 or greater. In Alabama, only the Mobile County School System qualified. The remaining systems with an ADM less than 50,000 comprised the remaining group.  
 Step 2: Select equivalent-size samples. Two equivalent annual sample groups were selected across the two size-stratified groups to create samples that were 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 were divided among the two annual sample groups to preserve their size equivalency.  
 Step 3: Adjust samples for indices equivalency. Once the annual sample groups were 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) was evaluated. To increase the indices’ equivalence between sample group percentages and the state population percentages, districts were selected and moved between groups, according to the impact of their index’s percentages on the sample group percentages.

The sampling includes three factors with 22 indices:

- 1) Gender (Male/Female);
- 2) Race/Ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, White, and Multiple Races); and
- 3) 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 was compared to 2018 Child Count data for the participating cohort districts. Differences between the responding sample and the population were 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 were charged with disseminating the state-developed Alabama Parent Survey to all parents of students with IEPs ages 3-21 within the district. Districts offered 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 were responsible for disseminating the surveys to parents and collecting completed surveys. The paper surveys were either assembled within the district office and mailed to the ALSDE or mailed directly to the ALSDE 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. Surveys were offered in Spanish and English, and districts offered additional languages, as needed.

Verification of entered surveys was conducted by reviewing a random sample of 5% of the surveys. To determine parent involvement ratings, parents

responded to 11 items on a 5-point scale. Parents whose average responses were 80% or higher (i.e., an average of “4” or higher), were coded as “schools facilitating parent involvement.”

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If 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

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

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

- 1) Black (8.3% underrepresented);
- 2) Multiple Races (4.33% overrepresented);
- 3) White (5.1% overrepresented);
- 4) Autism (5.5% overrepresented);
- 5) Other Health Impairment (6.9% underrepresented);
- 6) Specific Learning Disability (7.1% underrepresented); and
- 7) Speech/Language Impairment (3.6% overrepresented).

All seven of these indices were also over- or underrepresented in FFY 2017.

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

- 1) The ALSDE will implement a census survey in FFY 2019. The ALSDE will examine the district Child Count data as well as the responding sample from FFY 2019 and prior years to draw a new sample for FFY 2020.
- 2) For FFY 2019, the ALSDE will work to increase the response rate. For districts with lower than 15% response rate in the last survey administration, the ALSDE-SES staff will contact the Special Education Coordinators and offer technical assistance as needed to improve administration of the survey.
- 3) 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.
- 4) 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.
- 5) 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.

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

The state’s response rate for the FFY 2018 Alabama Parent Survey was 22.95%.

The FFY 2018 responding sample was compared to the FFY 2018 Child Count within the same cohort districts. The data below (see attachment, Part B Alabama\_FFY 2018 SPP-APR\_Ind 8 Table of Population Demographics for Cohort Districts) demonstrates the population demographics for the cohort districts, the demographics for the FFY 2018 responding sample, and the difference between the two samples.

Cohort Population	Responding Sample	Difference
<b>Gender</b>		
Male 33.28%	35.30%	2.02%
Female 66.72%	64.70%	-2.02%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Asian 1.05%	0.72%	-0.33%
Black 39.19%	30.88%	-8.31%
Hispanic 6.21%	5.55%	-0.66%
Native American 1.37%	1.23%	-0.14%
Multi-Race 2.12%	6.45%	4.33%
Pacific Islander 0.10%	0.14%	0.04%
White 49.96%	55.04%	5.08%
<b>Disability Category</b>		
Autism 8.70%	14.24%	5.54%
Deaf-Blindness 0.01%	0.22%	0.21%
Developmental Delay 6.75%	9.36%	2.61%
Emotional Disability 0.92%	1.80%	0.88%
Hearing Impairment 1.06%	1.04%	-0.02%
Intellectual Disability 7.25%	5.88%	-1.37%
Multiple Disabilities 1.27%	3.51%	2.24%
Orthopedic Impairment 0.74%	0.71%	-0.03%
Other Health Impairment 14.08%	7.18%	-6.90%
Specific Learning Disability 38.55%	31.50%	-7.05%
Speech/Language Impairment 19.95%	23.57%	3.62%
Traumatic Brain Injury 0.30%	0.47%	0.17%
Visual Impairment 0.44%	0.53%	0.09%

There were seven indices that were 3% greater or less than the expected values for the current cohort districts: Black/African American; Multiple Races; White; Autism; Other Health Impairment; Specific Learning Disability; and Speech/Language Impairment. The ALSDE-SES staff are taking steps to address these differences in future responding samples.

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

### **8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **8 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

### **8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.



## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	2.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

132

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	0	7	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 139 LEAs were included in the calculation of disproportionate representation.

Based on the data for all 139 LEAs, seven LEAs had a risk ratio of greater than 2.25 and met the state's minimum n- and/or cell-size of ten. The ALSDE excluded 132 LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation due to each not having met the minimum n- and/or cell-size.

**Step Two**

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

84

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
55	0	55	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**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 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 139 LEAs were included in the calculation of disproportionate representation.

Based on the data for all 139 LEAs, 55 LEAs had a risk ratio of greater than 2.50 and met the state's minimum n- and/or cell-size of ten. The ALSDE excluded 84 LEAs from the final determination of overrepresentation due to each not having met the minimum n- and/or cell-size.

**% of Districts Identified with Disproportionality (Overrepresentation) by Racial/Ethnic Group(s) in Specific Disability Categories:**

Autism = 6.47% (9 of 139) were overrepresented for White students.

Emotional Disability = 2.16% (3 of 139) were overrepresented for Black or African American students; 1.44% (2 of 139) were overrepresented for White students.

Intellectual Disability = 12.95% (18 of 139) were overrepresented for Black or African American students; 1.44% (2 of 139) were overrepresented for White students.

Other Health Impairment = 6.47% (9 of 139) were overrepresented for Black or African American students; 5.04% (7 of 139) were overrepresented for White students.

Specific Learning Disability = 9.35% (13 of 139) were overrepresented for Black or African American students; 0.72% (1 of 139) were overrepresented for White students.

Speech or Language Impairment = 0.72% (1 of 139) were overrepresented for Black or African American students; 7.9% (10 of 139) were overrepresented for White students.

Step Two

In determining if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as part of the data review, the ALSDE reviewed the 55 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 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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
  - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- 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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	82.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.70%	99.36%	99.51%	99.68%	99.77%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
23,303	23,233	99.77%	100%	99.70%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

70

**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 70, the following numbers indicate the range of days beyond the 60-day initial evaluation timeline when evaluations were completed for children: 1-15 days - 19; 16-30 days - 7; 31-45 days - 9; 46-60 days - 4; and 60+ days - 31. 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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
22	22	0	0

**FFY 2017 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 LEA’s report to determine whether all students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received and evaluated within the 60-day timeline with 100% accuracy. Additionally, the ALSDE has verified that all LEAs with noncompliance reflected in the data reported for this indicator are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the state’s data system. All reviews of updated data were conducted within one year from the notification of noncompliance. The LEAs identified as having noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2017 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 and all individual noncompliance was corrected for FFY 2017 within one year.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**11 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # 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.

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	76.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.50%	99.72%	99.86%	99.65%	99.83%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,617
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	262
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,181

d. Number 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.	102
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	71
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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	1,181	1,182	99.83%	100%	99.92%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

1

**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 1, 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 - 0; 31-45 Days - 0; 46-60 Days - 0; and 60+ Days - 1. The reason for delay is due to a central office delay.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The SES utilizes the state database to generate a report to collect data for Indicator 12. The LEAs submit data one time each year through the District Approval process for reporting in the APR. Reported data are for the entire reporting period and all LEAs in the state are included.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

**FFY 2017 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 2017 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 2017 was corrected within one year of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and no instance of noncompliance remains uncorrected from previous years.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Secondary transition: 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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2009	99.93%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.98%	99.97%	99.99%	99.91%	99.77%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
19,935	19,945	99.77%	100%	99.95%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

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.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, 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
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	15

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Using the state database, the ALSDE accessed and viewed each LEA's updated 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 2017 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 2017, the SES has verified that all LEAs have corrected each individual case of noncompliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the data system, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

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

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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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: States 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.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

#### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

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. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	22.24%	22.49%	22.74%	22.99%	23.24%
A	13.77%	Data	22.24%	25.38%	27.33%	27.81%	26.37%
B	2009	Target >=	62.35%	62.60%	62.85%	63.10%	63.35%
B	45.41%	Data	62.35%	65.71%	70.20%	60.20%	60.02%
C	2009	Target >=	76.36%	76.61%	76.86%	77.11%	77.36%
C	63.48%	Data	76.36%	74.29%	78.49%	68.85%	70.50%

### FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	23.49%	23.49%
Target B >=	63.60%	63.60%
Target C >=	77.61%	77.61%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

During the FFY 2018 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 were recent leavers. During the parent focus groups, participants received training from APEC on the secondary transition process.
- 2) Presenting on transition and post-school outcomes at several meetings. The ALSDE/SES staff presented transition data and information about the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) transition activities at the state's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) meetings and sought feedback from the SEAP. ALSDE/SES staff also presented to Alabama's National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Alignment Group meetings, allowing for internal collaboration on transition with ALSDE stakeholders.
- 3) Offering state-level transition training events throughout the year, including transition topics at the state's MEGA Conference; and two regional ENGAGE seminars with APEC for parents, professionals, and educators.
- 4) Gathering input from parents through various surveys:
  - 4a) Through work on the AL 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.

4b) 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 for follow-up training and product development.

4c) The ALSDE/SES partnered with the University of Alabama to develop and disseminate a statewide transition needs assessment for educators throughout the state.

**FFY 2018 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	1,344
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	361
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	509
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)	40
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).	106

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	361	1,344	26.37%	23.49%	26.86%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	870	1,344	60.02%	63.60%	64.73%	Met Target	No Slippage
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)	1,016	1,344	70.50%	77.61%	75.60%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If 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 representative sample is divided into two cohorts; therefore, half of the LEAs are represented each year. 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 were stratified into two groups, based on their student enrollment. Following OSEP's interpretation, the first group was comprised of the largest districts with an average daily membership (ADM) of 50,000 or greater. In Alabama, only the Mobile County School System qualified. The remaining systems with an ADM less than 50,000 comprised the remaining group.  
 Step 2: Select equivalent-size samples. Two equivalent annual sample groups were selected across the two size-stratified groups to create samples that were 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 were divided among the two annual sample groups to preserve their size equivalency.  
 Step 3: Adjust samples for indices equivalency. Once the annual sample groups were 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) was evaluated. To increase the indices'



equivalence between sample group percentages and the state population percentages, districts were selected and moved between groups, according to the impact of their index's percentages on the sample group percentages.

The sampling includes three factors with 22 indices:

- 1) Gender (Male/Female);
- 2) Race/Ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, White, and Multiple Races); and
- 3) 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 was compared to the population of students with IEPs one-year post-school for these 22 indices. 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.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	Alabama Post-School Outcomes Survey (Feb 2019)

**Include the State's analyses 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 FFY 2018 responding sample was compared to the sample leaver group within the same districts. The data below (see attachment, Part B Alabama\_FFY 2018 SPP-APR\_Ind 14 Table of Demographic Comparison of Sample) demonstrates the demographics for the entire FFY 2018 sample, the demographics for the FFY 2018 responding sample, and the difference between the two samples.

**Total Sample Responding Sample Difference**

**Gender**

Male 66.2% 67.2% 1.0%

Female 33.8% 32.8% -1.0%

**Race/Ethnicity**

Asian 0.47% 0.37% -0.1%

Black 43.38% 38.54% -4.8%

Hispanic 5.46% 5.28% -0.2%

Native American 1.28% 1.34% 0.1%

Multi-Race 0.95% 0.74% -0.2%

Pacific Islander 0.00% 0.00% 0.0%

White 48.46% 53.72% 5.3%

**Disability Category**

Autism 8.40% 9.67% 1.3%

Deaf-Blindness 0.00% 0.00% 0.0%

Developmental Delay 0.00% 0.00% 0.0%

Emotional Disability 1.23% 1.04% -0.2%

Hearing Impairment 1.61% 1.93% 0.3%

Intellectual Disability 9.44% 8.85% -0.6%

Multiple Disabilities 1.42% 1.56% 0.1%

Orthopedic Impairment 0.52% 0.30% -0.2%

Other Health Impairment 13.48% 13.39% -0.1%

Specific Learning Disability 61.65% 60.86% -0.8%

Speech/Language Impairment 1.47% 1.49% 0.0%

Traumatic Brain Injury 0.38% 0.45% 0.1%

Visual Impairment 0.38% 0.45% 0.1%

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

A comparison of the 22 indices showed the responding sample was within +/-3.0% for all of the indices except an underrepresentation of Black/African American students (-4.8%) and an overrepresentation of White students (+5.3%).

Alabama has continued its efforts to improve its response rate and will focus on ensuring underrepresented students are included. The Alabama State Department of Education will take the following two actions to improve the response rate of Black/African American students: 1) Emphasize to districts the importance of reminding students before leaving they will be contacted one year out; and 2) Ensure districts have the student's correct contact information via the student's academic and functional performance plan. External verification data found out-of-state phone numbers without area codes, business numbers, and phone numbers with missing digits. Establishing two points of contact with students should increase the response rate.

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

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **14 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its 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.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	94
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	7

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	47.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	28.72%	28.97%	29.22%	29.47%	29.72%
Data	28.72%	18.68%	34.07%	17.65%	27.78%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	29.97%	29.97%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	94	27.78%	29.97%	7.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Alabama experienced a decrease in the number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements. The confidential nature of the resolution process makes it difficult to accurately pinpoint why some resolution meetings were successful while others were not. A high percentage of due process complaints during FFY 2018 and FFY 2017 were withdrawn or dismissed, reflecting a comparable number of due process complaints resolved without a hearing for both reporting periods. For this reporting period, many complaints were resolved, but without a written agreement, and/or were resolved with a written agreement, but beyond the 30-day resolution period, causing slippage in the number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements. It should be noted that less complex complaints in FFY 2018 may have been resolved without a written agreement, and more complex complaints may have taken longer than the 30-day resolution period to resolve.

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

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	35
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	11
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	18

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ALSDE has solicited broad stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in order to review and revise, as necessary, SPP/APR targets. The input sessions consisted of a face-to-face meeting as well as video- and tele-conferences. Specifically, stakeholders offered input on setting new targets for the ALSDE to consider. Those recommendations are addressed in the respective indicators (i.e., 2, 4a, and 8).

In addition to soliciting input, the SES staff provided training regarding SPP/APR content and relevant data sources for new and veteran SEAP members. Ongoing training is being planned to ensure that SEAP members are kept abreast of SPP/APR reporting requirements and to ensure they are engaged in setting and/or revising indicator targets.

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	62.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	86.11%	86.36%	86.61%	86.86%	87.11%
Data	86.11%	89.74%	83.87%	92.73%	91.84%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	87.36%	87.36%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
11	18	35	91.84%	87.36%	82.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The mediation slippage can be attributed to the increase in the requests for facilitated IEPs and the ALSDE's processes that encourage informal resolution strategies related to complaints.

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

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**16 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

**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.**

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

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:**

State Director

#### **Email:**

crystalr@alsde.edu

#### **Phone:**

334-694-4782

#### **Submitted on:**

04/30/20 12:21:39 PM