

# Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education

Heidi Lieb-Williams, GCDSE Chair  
David Kohler, SEAP Chair

## SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL

FFY 2021

### ANNUAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA



*Creating change that improves the lives of Alaskans*

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education.....	5
Special Education Advisory Panel.....	5
(A) Funding and Staff.....	6
(B) Membership Requirements.....	6
Stakeholder Engagement.....	8
Data and Recommendation.....	8
References.....	16
Appendix A: Roles of the GCDSE.....	17
Appendix B: SEAP Roster of Members.....	18

## Executive Summary

Alaska's Governor's Council for Disabilities and Special Education (GCDSE), also referred to as the Council, is a singular entity which serves or governs several federally and state mandated functions relating to improving the lives of all individuals with disabilities. Of those federal mandates, one is the formation of a State Advisory Panel (SAP) under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (2004). The purpose of the SAP is to provide policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities. Alaska has established and maintains the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) to serve as its SAP. The SEAP is required to have a specific composition of members who are appointed by the Governor, of which "[a] majority of the members of the panel shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26) (IDEA, 2004). In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021, some members of the committee left and those position are still in the process of being filled. The SEAP improves the quality of special education services by advising the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) of six criteria:

1. Unmet needs within the State in the education of children with disabilities;
2. Public comments on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities;
3. Development of evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education
4. Development of corrective action plans;
5. Development and implementation of policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities; and
6. Aspects of determining the state's Significant Disproportionality Methodology.

Although the SEAP is responsible for advising the DEED, many stakeholders contribute to the recommendations about new and ongoing efforts to provide exemplary services for students with disabilities. Some of the stakeholders who provide feedback include Alaska parent information centers, the Special Education Advisory Panel, University of Alaska, parents, and all of Alaska's 59 school districts and educational service agencies.

Every FFY the SEAP submits the "Special Education Advisory Panel Annual Report" to the Office of the Governor. This report serves to apprise state officials, stakeholders and the public of compliance with its duties and membership requirements consistent with the provisions in Part B of the IDEA. The DEED is also tasked with compiling data and composing the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Plan (SPP/APR) annually by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The OSEP requires each state to meet 28 distinct targets based on 17 indicators. In FFY

2021, Alaska met nine targets, two targets did not apply, one target is not reported due to privacy protection, and 17 targets did not meet criteria. From 2014-2021, Alaska's IDEA Part B determination has been "Needs Assistance." OSEP has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2018, 2019, and 2020), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2021 determination. Any state who receives this rating two or more consecutive years is required to utilize technical assistance centers, including those funded by OSEP to correct insufficiencies. While not all targets that did not meet criteria require corrective action from OSEP, DEED must take corrective action for at least one target within each of the following indicators:

- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement
- Indicator 11: Child Find
- Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
- Indicator 13: Post-Secondary Transition
- Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

OSEP recommends DEED provide onsite monitoring or data collection through its data system for districts deemed to be non-compliant. The DEED must also utilize technical assistance centers to improve indicator and target scores. Furthermore, Alaska's SPP/APR scores indicate slippage in some targets which may be a result of the significant learning losses sustained by students with disabilities from the COVID-19 pandemic. ARPA ESSER III and Supplemental IDEA Part B funds awarded by the Department of Education and OSEP will be used to help mitigate the learning and regression in social skills students with disabilities experienced during school closures. From stakeholder input and numerous sources of data from DEED, the SEAP found the following areas of need within the State:

- Implementing full day extended school year;
- Providing greater access to students who need compensatory education and services;
- Exploring how additional funding could be used recruit, retain and create extra earning power or bonuses for special education assistants; and providing social skills mental health supports for students with disabilities.

The SEAP continued to have difficulty fulfilling its federally mandated IDEA requirements due to reduced funding. Subsequently, the committee was only able to meet twice during the FFY 2021. Lack of funding could compromise SEAP's ability to advise DEED, to the maximum extent possible, and to make substantive recommendations about improving special education services across the State. However, GCDSE is working with DEED to increase funding for FFY22 which will better allow SEAP to fulfill its requirements. The recommendations contained in this report are

intended to provide policy guidance with respect to improving the educational outcomes of Alaska's students with unique and specialized learning needs.

### **Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education**

In 1978 the Alaska legislature established the Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education (GCDSE), also referred to as the Council, to meet five state and federal statutory regulations relating to improving the lives of Alaskans with disabilities. Currently, the GCDSE has 25 members who reflect the diversity and rich cultural heritage in Alaska into one unique council. It serves as the governing body for the committees mandated by either the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (DD ACT) or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004). Federal committees the GCDSE oversees are the:

- State Advisory Panel (SAP);
- Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities (ICC)<sup>1</sup>; and
- State Council on Developmental Disabilities.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to fulfilling these roles, the Alaska legislature designated the GCDSE to govern and advise two State agencies which provide additional services for children with disabilities including the:

- Special Education Service Agency (SESA)<sup>3</sup>;
- Advisory Board to the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (AMHTA)<sup>4</sup> (see Appendix A).

### **Special Education Advisory Panel**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) states, "that [t]he State [will establish] and [maintain] an advisory panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State."<sup>5</sup> In response to this requirement, the Alaska Legislature formed the Special

---

<sup>1</sup> 20 U.S.C. § 1412 (a) (21)

<sup>2</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 15025

<sup>3</sup> AS 14.30.610

<sup>4</sup> AS 47.80.090

<sup>5</sup> § 1412 (a) (21)

Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and assigned the GCDSE to oversee its work.<sup>6</sup> The SEAP reports on the following criteria as required under IDEA (2004):<sup>7</sup>

1. Advise the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) of unmet needs within the State in the education of children with disabilities;
2. Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities;
3. Advise the State educational agency in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 1418 of this title;
4. Advise DEED in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA;
5. Advise DEED in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities; and
6. Advise the DEED on aspects of determining the state's Significant Disproportionality Methodology under IDEA<sup>8</sup>

#### **(A) Funding and Staff**

The SEAP continued to have difficulty fulfilling its federally mandated IDEA requirements due to reduced resources affecting capacity. Subsequently, the committee was only able to meet twice during the FFY21 (see Attachment). Insufficient funding could impact the SEAP's ability to advise DEED, to the maximum extent possible, and to make substantive recommendations about improving special education services across the State.

However, GCDSE is working with DEED to increase funding for FFY23 which will better allow SEAP to fulfill its requirements. The GCDSE has undergone many changes to the composition of its committees, structures and its staff. Council members, staff and leadership from DEED are working together to continue improving service delivery to affect positive outcomes.

#### **(B) Membership Requirements**

The SEAP is required to have a specific composition of members which are appointed by the Governor.<sup>9</sup> It must have at least one member to represent each IDEA category, but some members may belong to more than one. Furthermore, "[a] majority of the members of the panel shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children

---

<sup>6</sup> AS 14.30.231

<sup>7</sup> 20 U.S.C. § 1412 (d) (21)

<sup>8</sup> 34 CFR § § 300.646, .647

<sup>9</sup> § 1412 (b) (21)

with disabilities (ages birth through 26).<sup>10</sup> Table 1 (pg. 7) indicates each IDEA category and shows the number of SEAP committee members which were qualified to represent a category for FFY 2021. A detailed list of members can be found in Appendix B.

During the same time, the SEAP reported having 25 members; of those members, nine were qualified to represent more than one IDEA category (36%), while 16 members (64%) could only represent one category. The number of members who were either parents of children with disabilities or individuals with disabilities was eight (32%). One person reported being both a parent of a child with a disability and an individual with a disability; for the purpose of fulfilling the “majority” requirement, they were only counted once. 17 members (68%) were neither individuals with disabilities nor parents of children with disabilities. Filling all vacancies on the SEAP committee is a priority to ensure it is complying with the IDEA’s membership requirements.

Table 1.  
Composition of the Special Education Advisory Panel for FFY 2020-2021

IDEA Category	Number of Members
Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)	7
Individuals with disabilities	2
teachers	9
Representatives of institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel	2
State and local education officials	7
Officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (2015)	1
Administrators of programs for children with disabilities	3
Representatives of other State agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities	4
Representatives of private schools	2
Representatives of public charter schools	*
Not less than 1 representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities	2
A representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care	*
Representative of the adult corrections agencies	1
Representative from the State juvenile	1

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> 42 U.S.C § 11431 et. seq.

*\*currently recruiting*

## Stakeholder Engagement

One of the most important indicators of the level of progress across the State is the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). Many stakeholders contributed to the SPP/APR which helps the SEAP make recommendations about new and ongoing efforts to provide exemplary services for students with disabilities. Some of the stakeholders who provided feedback were the Education Committee of the GCDSE, LINKS and Stone Soup Group (Alaska parent information centers); SESA; University of Alaska; parents, and all of Alaska's 59 school districts and/or educational service agencies.

## Data and Recommendations

### **1. Advise the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) of unmet needs within the State in the education of children with disabilities.**

The loss of learning students with disabilities sustained due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic has been significant. Through stakeholder input and numerous sources of data from DEED, the SEAP found the following potential areas of need within the State:

- Implementing full day extended school year;
- Providing greater access to students who need compensatory education and services;
- Exploring how additional funding could be used recruit, retain and create extra earning power or bonuses for special education assistants; and
- Providing social skills mental health supports for students with disabilities.

### **2. Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities.**

The SEAP proposed suggestions related to the allocation of funds as part of the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Supplemental—IDEA Part B. The committee believes that it is critical for the State to utilize the federal funding for activities which directly support individualized academic social activities. The SEAP recommends isolating funds for compensatory services, extracurricular activities, and social groups which address regression of social skills and mental health. Stakeholder feedback included suggestions that DEED develop guidance documents for the expenditure of ARPA ESSER and ESSER Supplemental—IDEA Part B funds.

### **3. Advise the DEED in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary [of Education].<sup>12</sup>**

The DEED collects data from school districts, its data monitoring systems and stakeholders throughout the FFY to report the on status of special education programs to the OSEP. The annual State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR): Part B is a requirement for the state formula grant programs under IDEA. The following indicators, required by OSEP, show the data reported by DEED.

#### **Indicator 1: Graduation Rates (Target: Not met)**

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.  
FFY 2018 Data—56.94%; 2019 Target—90%; FFY 2019 Data—59.75%.

#### **Indicator 2: Dropout Rates (Target: Met)**

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.  
FFY 2018 Data—5.16%; FFY 2019 Target—5%; FFY 2019 Data—4.9%.

#### **Indicator 3B: Assessment Participation rates for students with IEPs (Target: N/A)**

No statewide assessments were administered during the 2019-20 school year. There is a COVID-19 waiver for those assessments.

#### **Indicator 3C: Assessment Proficiency rates for students with disabilities (Target: N/A)**

No statewide assessments were administered during the 2019-20 school year. There is a COVID-19 waiver for those assessments.

#### **Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion (Target: Not met)**

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 disabilities.  
FFY 2018 Data—10%; FFY 2019 Target—3%; FFY 2019 Data—5.66%. Number of discrepant districts: 3.

#### **Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion (Target: Met)**

Percent of districts that have (a) a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities; and (b) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.  
FFY 2018 Data—0%; FFY 2019; Target—0%; FFY 2019 Data—0%.

---

<sup>12</sup> 20 U.S.C. § 1418

Number of discrepant districts: 5—Of these districts, zero had policies, practices or procedures that contributed to the discrepancy.

### **Indicator 5: 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. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—65.01%; FFY 2019 Target—65%; FFY 2019 Data—64.18%.

**(B) Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—8.90%; 2019 Target—9.00%; 2019 Data—10.47%.

**(C) Served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—2.45; 2019 Target—1.85; 2019 Data—2.49%.

### **Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Percent of children age 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

**(A) Regular education early childhood program and receiving most of the special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—22.81%; 2019 Target—28.00%; 2019 Data—25.42%.

**(B) Percent of children age 3 through 5 with IEPs attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—49.78%; 2019 Target—38.00%; 2019 Data—49.88%.

### **Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improvement:

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

**(A1) Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (Target: Met)**

FFY 2018 Data—87.00%; 2019 Target—75.50%; 2019 Data—85.6%.

**(A2) The percent of children who were functioning within age expectation by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—44.84%; 2019 Target—62.00%; 2019 Data—44.4%.

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy.**

**(B1)** Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. **(Target: Met)**

FFY 2018 Data—88.21%; 2019 Target—77.30%; 2019 Data—90.52%.

**(B2)** The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. **(Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—46.56%; 2019 Target—63.90%; 2019 Data—40.35%.

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

**(C1)** Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**(Target: Met)**

FFY 2018 Data—84.59%; 2019 Target—75.20%; 2019 Data—88.05%.

**(C2)** The percentage of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. **(Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—49.89%; 2019 Target—68.80%; 2019 Data—49.46%.

**Indicator 8: Parent Involvement (Target: Met, Action required)**

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.

FFY 2018 Data—96.85%; 2019 Target—60.00%; 2019 Data—67.85%.

*\*OSEP Found that it was unclear if the response data were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.*

**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation (Target met)**

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. The one district identified in FFY 2019 was not found to have disproportionality that was the result of inappropriate identification. Alaska DEED did not make any findings of noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2019.

**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation (Target met)**

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

17 of 38 districts had disproportionate representation in specific disability categories. None were found to be the result of inappropriate identification.

**Indicator 11: Child Find (Target: Not met, Action required)**

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 timeline.

FFY 2018 Data—96.85%; 2019 Target—100%; 2019 Data—92.76%.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition (Target: Not met, Action required)**

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.

FFY 2018 Data—96.02%; 2019 Target—100%; 2019 Data—94.44%.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (Target: Not met, Action required)**

Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and with an IEP that includes appropriate post-secondary 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 post-secondary goals; and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service 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. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and over with compliant secondary transition plan.

FFY 2018 Data—96.93%; 2019 Target—100%; 2019 Data—95.05%.

**Indicator 14: Post-Secondary Outcomes (Targets: Not met, Action required)**

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

**(A) Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—13.17%; 2019 Target—16.25%; 2019 Data—12.91%.

**(B) Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—56.72%; 2019 Target—59.25%; 2019 Data—54.49%.

**(C) Enrolled in higher education or in some other post-secondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. (Target: Not met)**

FFY 2018 Data—68.82%; 2019 Target—70.55%; 2019 Data—63.36%.

### **Indicators 15: Dispute Resolution (Target: Not met)**

Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

FFY 2019 Data:

- number of resolution session: 4
- number of resolutions sessions held that resulted in agreements 0

\*Not required to meet target if number of disputes is below 10.

### **Indicator 16: Mediation (Target: Met)**

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

FFY 2019 Data:

- related to due process complaints: 0
- not related to due process complaints: 3
- number of mediations held: 3

\*Not required to meet target if number of disputes is below 10.

### **Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (N/A)**

The State's Systemic Plan (SSIP) attachment was not embedded due to privacy protections.

### **3. Advise DEED in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA.**

OSEP determined from the 2021 SPP/APR submission that overall DEED was in the "needs assistance" category. Corrective action plans should be developed to address OSEP's required actions and reported in 2022 SPP/APR submission.

**Indicator 8: Parent Involvement:** DEED reported the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the Alaska. However, in its narrative, the DEED reported, "Caucasians were over-represented by 9.2% in the results, Alaska Natives were under-represented by 6.4% and parents of students with specific learning disabilities were under-represented by 6.7%." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the DEED must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the DEED is taking to address this issue. It 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 11: Child Find:** Because DEED reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, DEED must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the DEED must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 SPP/APR, DEED must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DEED did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition:** Because DEED reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, it must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DEED must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 SPP/APR, DEED must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If DEED did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DEED did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition:** When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DEED must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified 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. DEED must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If DEED did not identify any findings of noncompliance, although its data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. The SEAP and its stakeholders would benefit from DEED providing

details on the sources of technical assistance it is utilizing to correct its required indicators.

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes:** DEED must report whether the 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. DEED 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.

**4. Advise DEED in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.**

Ensure that schools have a plan and are prepared to conduct virtual eligibility determinations within Alaska's timeframe for parental consent (90 calendar days) should schools remain closed for extended periods of time. The DEED should also verify with each LEA with non-compliance in Indicator 12 of the SPP/APR that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and that it describes specific action taken to the verify the correction.

**5. Advise the DEED on aspects of determining the state's Significant Disproportionality Methodology under IDEA<sup>13</sup>**

Each district identified with a risk ratio of 2.5 or greater is required to complete a self-assessment designed to evaluate policies, procedures and practices related to the identification of students as students with disabilities (including requirements related to child find, evaluations and eligibility determinations). DEED's staff should follow up to verify the results of the self-assessment survey which includes the review of files for students in the category that was overidentified.

---

<sup>13</sup> 34 C.F.R. § § 300.646, .647

## References

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et. seq. (2004)

34 C.F.R. §§ 300.646, .647 (2004)

Special Education Advisory Panel, AS14.30.231 (1978)

20 U.S.C. § 1441 (2017). Part C Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

Special Education Service Agency; AS 14.30.610 (1986)

Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 15001 et. seq. (2000)

State Council on Developmental Disabilities AS47.80.030; AS 47.20.020 (1991)

Advisory Board to the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority, AS 47.80.090

20 U.S.C. § 1418 (2004).

20 U.S.C. §1412 (21) (IDEA Part B)

## Appendix A

### Roles of the GCDSE

#### Federal Statutory Committees

##### State Advisory Panel

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) states, “that [t]he State [will establish] and [maintain] an advisory panel for the purpose of providing policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State.” In response to this requirement, the Alaska Legislature formed the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and assigned the GCDSE to oversee its work.

##### Interagency Coordinating Council for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities (ICC)

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Council serves as the ICC, which advises the DEED in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. The statewide Early Intervention/Infant Learning Program (EI/ILP) fulfills the role of the

**ICC State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)** Under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (2000), the GCDSE serves as the DD Council. It is responsible for interdepartmental planning and coordination of services for persons with developmental disabilities. The DD Council creates changes that improve the independence, self-determination, and work and daily living skills to become productive members of the community.

#### State Mandated Committees

##### Governing Body of the Special Education Service Agency (SESA)

Members of the Council act as the governing board for the Special Education Services Agency, which supports the effective education of students with low incidence disabilities throughout Alaska. In that capacity, the Council Members comprise the majority of the SESA Board and receive reports and updates on the educational service needs and delivery throughout the state.

##### Advisory Board to the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (AMHTA)

The Council reports to the AMHTA on the status and needs of individuals with developmental disabilities and their families to make recommendations for funding on their behalf. AMHTA representatives participate in GCDSE committees and report to the during council meetings.

## Appendix B

### Composition of the Special Education Advisory Panel for SFY 2020-2021

SEAP Category	Representatives
Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)	Ina Boucher, Shelly Vendetti-Vuckovich, Chad Hansen, Heidi Lieb-Williams, Fred Villa, Elizabeth Joseph, Alex Fogarty
Individuals with disabilities	Heidi Lieb-Williams, Courtney Westmann
Teachers	Molly Mc Manamin, Ina Boucher, David Kohler, Ernie Manzie, Kathryn Rose, Elizabeth Joseph, Fred Villa, Courtney Westmann
Representatives of institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel	Fred Villa, Greg Sampson
State and local education officials	Don Enoch, David Kohler, Sarah Doutre, Colleen Shivers, Kate Foster Julie Conner,
Officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act	Kathryn Rose
Administrators of programs for children with disabilities	Clayton Holland, Alex Fogarty Brian Ross
Representatives of private schools	Kathy Gustafson, Brian Ross
Representatives of public charter schools	*

Not less than 1 representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities	David Kohler, Shawn Bernard
A representative from the State child welfare agency responsible for foster care	*
Representative of the adult corrections agencies	Karen Jenkins
Representative from the state juvenile department	Kelly Manning

*\*currently recruiting*

*Creating Change that improves the lives of Alaskans  
with disabilities.*



*This report was prepared by Michele Binkley, staff to the GCDSE and with the assistance of the GCDSE Chair, the Chair of the Special Education Advisory Panel and the GCDSE Planner. Any questions, comments, or corrections should be directed to the Governor's Council on Disabilities & Special Education, 550 W. 7th Avenue, Suite 1230, Anchorage, Alaska 99501; [GCDSE\\_Staff@alaska.gov](mailto:GCDSE_Staff@alaska.gov)*