



State of Arizona
Department of Education



**Arizona
State Performance Plan
Annual Performance Report
For Special Education
FFY 2014**

ESS

Highly Effective Schools Division
Exceptional Student Services
1535 W Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007

<http://www.azed.gov/>

AZ
Part B

FFY2014
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) system of general supervision comprises the following components: Program Support and Monitoring, Dispute Resolution, and Fiscal Monitoring. The general supervision system is based upon the shift to results-driven accountability and provides a balance between compliance and outcomes for students with disabilities. During the 2014–2015 school year, ADE/ESS transitioned from a six-year monitoring cycle to the Examining Practices monitoring model.

The general supervision system is structured around collaborative conversations and technical assistance. **All schools** will be involved in the following activities in the transition year:

- Technical assistance from ESS
- Review of policies and procedures
- Collection of student exit data
- Collection of post-school outcomes
- Collection of indicators 11 and 13 data

During the transition year, ADE reviewed data with local education agencies (LEAs) to determine general supervision activities for the next year. ADE/ESS used methods and procedures to carry out general supervision requirements that are consistent, but flexible, in order to adapt to the varying needs of children, educational settings, and administrative realities. When ADE reviews data, an LEA's monitoring schedule may be adjusted, and Examining Practices activities may be assigned anytime data indicate broad issues across systems.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

627

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

Exceptional Student Services Monitoring Model

The Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services (ESS), revised its monitoring system in 2014 to align with the principles of results-driven accountability and provide a more balanced approach in supporting LEAs. The new Examining Practices system was revised to increase the focus on data through results-driven accountability with less emphasis being put on procedural compliance. While procedural compliance is important, it is no longer the sole focus of the new Examining Practices monitoring model. In addition, ADE/ESS is working with LEAs to help them develop their own systems of internal supervision. Examining Practices will consider compliance and outcomes in the review of LEA policies and procedures and practices, as well as in conversations about an LEA's own internal supervision system.

The program specialist assigned to the school district or charter school meets with the LEA director each spring to discuss the LEA data to plan for any upcoming Examining Practices activities.

The better the data are across systems, the better an LEA is able to provide quality programs for students with disabilities.

Arizona has found it essential to include LEA staff as active partners with ADE/ESS staff when examining LEA data, but especially when examining LEA practices. Some tasks are completed together, and some tasks are completed by the LEA staff after they receive training from the ESS staff. The LEA must have a team of active participants, which includes LEA special education personnel and a general education representative.

Ongoing technical assistance plays a significant role in the general supervision of LEAs in Arizona. ESS program specialists conduct annual site visits with each assigned LEA to review the LEA's system of internal supervision and its policies, procedures, and practices. Also included are data related to indicators 11 and 13—the targeted indicators. Program specialists provide ongoing technical assistance related to other issues and questions that may arise. Targeted training is available when data indicate a need.

Every year, all LEAs in the state use the Risk Analysis tool to determine which level of support is appropriate for them for that year. The Risk Analysis tool contains several factors that are determinant in an LEA's need for training and professional development in both areas of compliance and results. There are three levels of support: direct, guided, and independent.

During the transition year, LEAs that were scheduled to be monitored based on the prior six-year monitoring cycle were considered to be in the direct level of support. The risk analysis score determined whether an LEA to be monitored was given option 1 or option 2 as shown below. All other LEAs in the state were placed in guided or independent support based on the risk analysis score.

Direct Support:

Direct contact with an ESS program specialist who leads the LEAs through the activities and monitors their progress

Option 1: EDISA Five-Year Cycle, Indicator 11 & Indicator 13 data collected every year

- Year 1: Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement (EDISA)
 - LEAs in EDISA will attend three workshops throughout the school year. Each workshop is held for two days. During the workshop, each team develops a root cause analysis based on school data. The teams then develop Action Plans, outlining which activities will take place over the next year to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Year 2: Implement Action Plan
- Year 3: Qualitative data/reflection/plan for changes or implementation
- Year 4: Progress monitor/plan for changes or implementation
- Year 5: Peer progress monitor

Option 2: Tier 4 Activities, Three-Year Cycle, Indicator 11 & Indicator 13 data collected every year

- Year 1: Develop Action Plan (based on data, guiding questions, and/or internal system of supervision)
- Year 2: Implement Action Plan
- Year 3: Progress monitor/plan for changes or implementation

Guided Support:

ESS program specialist guides an LEA team through activities

Based on risk analysis factors

- Data analysis to determine root causes
- Collection of Indicator 11 & Indicator 13 data
- Professional development
- Guide steps training
- Specialist's completion of tracking form

-

Independent Support—LEA conducts activities independently with ESS specialist consult

Based on risk analysis factors

- Data review and guiding question analysis
- Indicators 11 and 13 data collection, verified by ESS specialist
- Specialist's completion of tracking form

Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement

(EDISA)

Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement (EDISA) is a collaborative partnership between local education agencies and ADE in a team-training program designed to close achievement gaps between students with special needs and their nondisabled peers. EDISA facilitators and ESS coaches guide district- and building-level data action teams through a Data Use Framework that supports continuous improvement by leading teams to discover causes of the achievement gaps between students and to develop plans to improve outcomes. The focus has been on reading thus far; however, any area can be incorporated into the framework.

This training focuses on eight stages of a comprehensive Data Use Framework. The concept has four phases: preparation, inquiry, planning, and action. The goal of the training is for teams to utilize data to identify the causes of the reading achievement gap between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers and to narrow the gap by increasing positive outcomes in reading achievement for all students.

Team success is evaluated based on the team's application of the Data Use Framework to

1. Identify relevant data that will address a problem or concern;
2. Conduct data analysis and determine actionable causes;
3. Develop measurable outcomes and identify strategic activities;
4. Implement the plan with integrity and evaluate progress.

Enforcement Activities

If an LEA is unable to correct all identified noncompliance within a year from the Written Notification of Findings letter, one or more of the following enforcement actions will be taken, based on the severity of the remaining noncompliance. LEAs are entitled to request a hearing if they wish to challenge the enforcement action(s).

ESS development of a prescribed Action Plan with required activities and timelines to address the continuing noncompliance.

Enforcement of Action Plan activities as outlined in the current agency Action Plan.

Review and revision of the current Action Plan to develop targeted activities that address the continuing noncompliance.

Special monitor selection.

Interruption of IDEA payments until adequate compliance is achieved. For charter schools not receiving IDEA funds, a request for withholding 10% of state funds.

For charter schools, a request to the appropriate board for a notice of intent to revoke the charter.

With the Arizona State Board of Education approval, interruption of Group B weighted state aid or redirection of funds pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.222(a).

Request to the attorney general for assistance in law enforcement.

Dispute Resolution

In addition to monitoring findings, noncompliance with IDEA is identified through formal complaints and due process hearings, which are overseen by Dispute Resolution

ADE/Dispute Resolution employs four State complaint investigators who work under the supervision of the Director of Dispute Resolution. The director assigns incoming complaints, monitors the investigation progress, and reviews and signs all Letters of Finding. Upon a finding of noncompliance identified by a complaint investigator, corrective action is ordered in a Letter of Findings that either requires the immediate provision of services or the immediate cessation of noncompliance, whichever is necessary. The letter also outlines the necessary steps required to prevent the reoccurrence of noncompliance and states what is considered sufficient documentation to ensure that noncompliance has been addressed and to minimize the effects of the violations. ADE/Dispute Resolution employs a Corrective Action Compliance Monitor (CACM) to collect the required documentation, monitor timelines, and provide technical assistance, as necessary.

When both parties to a State administrative complaint agree that a mutually beneficial resolution can be reached without the need for a full investigation, the assigned complaint investigator may assist the parties in reaching an informal resolution. Although no formal resolution agreement is required, if the complaining party indicates that she or he is satisfied with the PEA's response to the complaint, the complaint investigator will issue a withdrawal letter. If the complaining party changes his or her mind about informal resolution and wants the investigation to go forward, the individual may notify the Dispute Resolution office within five business days and the investigation will move forward.

Beginning in August 2005, Arizona switched from a two-tiered due process system to a single-tiered system. Due process hearings are conducted on behalf of the Arizona Department of Education by the Arizona Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). The OAH employs full-time administrative law judges (ALJs), all of whom are attorneys licensed to practice law in Arizona. The ALJs assigned to hear special education due process hearings are knowledgeable about the IDEA and receive yearly training.

Arizona has a system that allows for mediation of any dispute between parents and PEAs—it is not necessary for either to file a request for a due process hearing to utilize mediation services. Mediators are available statewide and have been trained on both mediation strategies and IDEA requirements.

Incentives, Sanctions, and Enforcement

Incentives Related to Monitoring

During FFY 2014, the State offered the following incentives for PEAs that, upon completion of their monitoring, exhibited exemplary compliance with IDEA requirements:

1. ADE/ESS provided two paid registrations for either the ESS Directors Institute or the Transition Conference for PEAs that demonstrated 100% compliance on Indicators 11 and 13 in a data review monitoring.
2. ADE/ESS gave one paid registration for either the ESS Directors Institute or the Transition Conference to PEAs that had no findings at the completion of the self-assessment monitoring.

Sanctions and Enforcement Related to Monitoring

Arizona uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public education agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes and regulations related to special education. The following list of the State's enforcement steps may be imposed based upon the severity of the remaining noncompliance:

ESS development of a prescribed corrective action plan (CAP) with required activities and timelines to address the continuing noncompliance.

Enforcement of CAP activities as outlined in the current CAP.

Review and revision of the current CAP to develop targeted activities that address the continuing noncompliance.

Assignment of a special monitor.

- Interruption of IDEA payments until adequate compliance is achieved. For charter schools not receiving IDEA funds, a request to begin withholding 10% of State funds.
- For charter schools, a request to the appropriate board for a notice of intent to revoke the charter.
- With Arizona State Board of Education approval, interruption of Group B weighted State aid or redirection of funds pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.227(a).
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Sanctions and Enforcement Related to Dispute Resolution

Upon a finding of noncompliance identified in a State administrative complaint, corrective action is ordered in a Letter of Findings, and documentation of the corrective action submitted will be reviewed by the Corrective Action Compliance Monitor (CACM). If the corrective action documentation received is incomplete or not completed as specified in the Letter of Findings or if no documentation is received from the PEA by the date specified in the Letter of Findings, then the following steps will be taken by the PEA and ADE/Dispute Resolution:

Within five business days following the due date specified in the Letter of Findings, the CACM will attempt to informally communicate with the PEA via phone calls and/or emails for the following purpose(s):

- to inquire as to why the corrective action is incomplete and to direct the PEA to immediately submit the completed corrective action documentation;
- to provide feedback on any concerns with the documentation submitted, to give clarification on the requirements, and to direct the PEA to revise and resubmit the corrective action documentation within a specified timeframe; or
- to inquire as to why the corrective action has not been submitted and to direct the PEA to immediately submit the completed corrective action documentation.
- If the delay in submitting the documentation is due to extenuating circumstances and the CACM determines based on those circumstances that it is reasonable to negotiate a new due date for the corrective action to be submitted, the CACM will send a Letter of Understanding, with a copy to the complainant, detailing (a) the CACM's concerns and the PEA's explanation, (b) any decisions made to resolve the problem, and (c) a new negotiated due date.

If the concerns were not resolved using the informal procedures described above, the CACM will send a Letter of Inquiry to the PEA, with a copy provided to the complainant. A Letter of Inquiry may be sent for any of the following reasons:

- The PEA is nonresponsive to the CACM's attempts at informal communication.
- The CACM and the PEA are not able to resolve concerns with the content of corrective action documentation submitted or the PEA's failure to submit all required corrective action documentation through informal communication.
- The CACM is not satisfied with the PEA's response to informal inquiries for reasons such as the PEA does not intend to complete and submit the corrective action, the PEA refuses to make needed changes to corrective action documentation, or the PEA's informal explanation of the circumstances causing the delay in submitting corrective action documentation is unacceptable to the CACM.
- The PEA fails to submit new or revised corrective action documentation within the informally negotiated timeframe or by the new due date set forth in the Letter of Understanding.
- In other cases determined necessary and appropriate by the CACM.
- The PEA must provide a Letter of Explanation to ADE/Dispute Resolution within three business days of receipt of the Letter of Inquiry fully answering the inquiry and explaining the circumstances surrounding the non-submission of or failure to complete the corrective action documentation.
- If the circumstances are acceptable, then the CACM will send a Letter of Understanding, with a copy to the complainant, detailing (a) the CACM's concerns and the PEA's explanation, (b) any decisions made to resolve

the problem, and (c) a new negotiated due date. If the circumstances are unacceptable or the PEA does not respond to the Letter of Inquiry as noted above, then the CACM will compose a Letter of Enforcement.

If the corrective action documentation submitted was not completed as specified in the Letter of Findings and following informal communication between the CACM and the PEA, the revised and resubmitted corrective action documentation was not satisfactory, the CACM will inform the PEA via Letter of Clarification, with a copy to the complainant, that the corrective action item in question must be revised. A new due date for the revised corrective action will be assigned in this letter and technical assistance will be offered.

If, after the steps outlined above have been taken, the corrective action documentation received remains incomplete or has not been received by ADE/Dispute Resolution or the corrective action has not been completed as specified in the Letter of Findings, the CACM will send a Letter of Enforcement to the chief administrator of the PEA, with a copy to the special education director or coordinator and the complainant, detailing the corrective action items that are incomplete, the corrective action items that were not completed as specified in the Letter of Findings, or those items that have not been received.

The Letter of Enforcement will outline which of the following enforcement options will be taken:

- Interruption of federal funds
- Redirection of federal funds to ensure the child receives a free appropriate public education (FAPE)
- If applicable, reporting of violations to a sponsoring entity for charter schools and seeking of remedies through the appropriate board.

Once all corrective action documentation has been received, reviewed, and accepted by ADE/Dispute Resolution, a Letter of Completion will be sent to the chief administrator, the special education director or coordinator of the PEA, the ADE/ESS education program specialist assigned to assist the public education agency, and the complainant.

ESS Fiscal Monitoring

Receiving federal grant monies entails both programmatic and financial duties, which include proper programming and expenditure of monies, goals achievement, and related reporting. Information related to the key areas addressed during the fiscal monitoring of federal funds are:

1. Payroll Expenditure Compliance, including Time and Effort
2. Non Payroll Expenditure Compliance
3. Internal Controls
4. Fixed Asset Compliance—Fixed asset refers to tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition as defined by the district or charter’s fixed-asset policy
5. Grants Management Compliance

ADE chooses approximately 200 LEAs per year for fiscal monitoring using a three-year rotational cycle. However, LEAs with a higher risk can be selected any year. The LEAs go through a risk assessment based on the expenditure report provided by the LEAs and internal data gathered by ESS. If there is a high risk indicated on the expenditure report and internal data, certain expenditures are selected as sample items, and the LEA is required to provide supporting documentation for these sample items. If further concerns arise, the LEA will be contacted and an on-site review will be conducted. This process provides a higher level of monitoring than the monitoring that was done previously, spending resources on those LEAs that need assistance.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The ESS technical assistance system involves providing information and guidance on promising practices in educating students with disabilities and also furnishing information and guidance on IDEA and Arizona regulations and policies. This assistance is carried out through site visits, the consultant of the day (COD) telephone line, and materials found on the ESS Web sites, as well as information found on the Promising Practices Web site.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

Annually, the Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services, surveys constituents to identify needs in professional development and technical assistance. Needs are also identified through the evaluation of indicator data and the assessment of compliance with legal mandates. Based on those needs, ESS provides professional development and technical assistance using various instructional designs. As stated in Learning Forward’s Standards for Professional Learning, all ESS’s professional development promotes active engagement, focuses on increasing educator effectiveness, and applies learning theories, research, and models.

Delivery models for this training include single and multi-year implementation grants, face-to face professional development, online professional development, and online modules; this professional development training can be delivered to groups of any size or to individuals. Many grants include the use of coaches to ensure that learning leads to implementation and change. Participants in all trainings and presentations are surveyed to determine whether preparation, training design, materials, and outcomes met the Standards for Professional Learning. Survey feedback is routinely reviewed and used to revise or develop subsequent training and presentations.

The following training opportunities were offered to teaching professionals to meet specific professional development needs in Arizona:

Coach for Success

Initial Training—September 24–25, 2015

Follow-Up Training—November 12–13, 2015

Webinar—December 3, 2015

In collaboration with WestEd, Arizona Department of Education’s K–12 Academic Standards and Exceptional Student Services sections hosted a three-session coaching training. This coaching training prepared staff to use a process of observation and analysis in a variety of settings to support teaching and learning. Participants were guided through a differentiated coaching process and learned a system designed to provide useful feedback to teachers while at the same time guiding the improvement of effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners. When considering the language used in coaching along a continuum (direct, evaluative, consultative, collaborative, and coaching), this training provided explicit instruction on using language that is direct, evaluative, and consultative while blending in coaching language.

Professional development and coaching was provided in a four-step process. Participants learned differentiated coaching strategies, including theoretical and skill applications that served as the framework for direct, facilitative, and blended coaching models. Also, participants heard about how to determine which type of coaching message, format, and approach best supports teachers as learners. Strategies for difficult conversations and varied ways to work with adult learners, along with strategies

to develop trust, improve communication, and guide adults through the change process were also addressed. The strategies learned through this professional development series provided school and district teams with practical applications that advanced their instruction toward a collective responsibility for student learning.

De-Escalate: Stop the Power Struggle

February 24, 2015

In this full-day session, participants learned prevention and de-escalation techniques, as well as the importance of understanding their own emotional states in avoiding power struggles. Participants had the opportunity to connect and apply these techniques through case studies, role play activities, and real-life discussions and examples and learned how to make connections to their own emotional reactions and how these reactions related to their students' responses. This session was for any school staff members who wanted to be proficient at de-escalating and avoiding power struggles with students.

Introduction to Co-Teaching: A Model for Effective Instruction for All Students

January 21–22, 2015

This two-day introduction to co-teaching was for school site teams of administrators, coaches, and teacher leaders who were interested in learning more about the theory, purpose, and requirements of effective co-teaching. The role of co-teaching in addressing the rigor of Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards (AZCCRS), as well as serving students in the least restrictive environment and the practical hands-on tools teachers need to make co-teaching work in the classroom were presented.

Training Outcomes: After this two-day workshop, participants were able to

- understand the pedagogy of co-teaching;
- identify the challenges of and needs for successful implementation of co-teaching;
- create a plan for successful implementation of co-teaching;
- identify potential co-teachers;
- establish criteria for the measurements of success.

Meeting Arizona's College and Career Ready Standards for Special Education

Elementary Emphasis—January 7–8, 2015—Phoenix

Secondary Emphasis—March 4–5, 2015—Casa Grande

Elementary & Secondary Emphasis—May 23–24, 2015—Yuma

Throughout the two-day workshop, participants had the opportunity to engage in whole group, small group, and paired collaborative discussions within grade level and content areas to refine collaborative practices between general education and special education and develop and write AZCCRS standards-based individualized education program (IEP) goals.

Training Outcomes: During this two-day workshop, participants

- expanded understanding of the AZCCRS for English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy and Mathematics in order to develop standards-aligned IEP goals aligned to the student's AZCCRS present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP).
- integrated research of how children learn in order to identify areas of need in the development of IEP goals.

- obtained a solid understanding of universal design for learning (UDL) to integrate the principles into daily practice.
- developed and wrote standards-aligned IEP goals related to students' needs as described in the PLAAFP.
- explored and used readily available resources, tools, and evidenced-based strategies to support students with disabilities in accessing the AZCCRS in ELA/Literacy and Mathematics.

Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making

November 5–6, 2014

Utilizing materials from the What Works Clearinghouse and other evidence-based sources, participants

- learned the basics of student achievement data—what it is, where to find it, what to do with it.
- practiced working together to analyze student achievement data and make instructional decisions, using a research-based process.
- assessed their school's current process for using data to improve instruction, using a comprehensive planning template.
- explored strategies for improving outcomes for students with disabilities, English language learners, and other students whose achievement falls short.

Using student achievement data to support instructional decision-making is a collaborative process. Therefore, participants were encouraged to register in teams, either already-formed data teams or simply multiple participants from the same school. A portion of this workshop was dedicated to planning and working in school teams, but individuals who attended on their own benefitted as well.

A Principal's Primer for Raising Reading Achievement

July 15–16, 2015

In collaboration with Voyager Sopris Learning, Arizona Department of Education's Exceptional Student Services hosted a two-day leadership training on raising reading achievement. This training was a "how-to" professional development opportunity for district and school administrators who wanted to improve the overall reading performance of an elementary or middle school population.

The training, led by Pati Montgomery, Ed.S., provided practical instruction on how a principal can lead a school to implement research-based, multi-tiered reading instruction and achieve optimal results, especially with students with disabilities and students from economically, socially, or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds.

Target Audience: Principals and district-level administrators

Secure Care

During the 2014–2015 school year, the ESS Secure Care team worked with county and state secure care schools in various stages of compliance monitoring. MET/IEP, child find, secondary transition, and prior written notice trainings were given by Secure Care team members to secure care school staff during monitoring corrective action plan years, and compliance monitoring pre-trainings were provided to schools that are being monitored during the 2015–2016 school year. All training was adapted to meet the unique needs of staff who work with students with disabilities in secure care settings.

Data Management

During the 2014–2015 school year, the ESS Data Management team provided trainings on three areas of data collection: October 1, 2014, Special Education Census and Annual Data Collection (ADC), as well as offering supplemental training on the Arizona Department of Education’s Student Accountability Information System (SAIS).

For the October 1, 2014, Special Education Census, a series of trainings were offered during the fall, winter, and spring to cover the entire census process to include verification (phase 1), reconciliation (phase 2), and non-reconciliation (phase 3). For the verification phase, two regional workshops and four webinars were offered. For the reconciliation phase, two regional workshops and two webinars were offered. In addition to the reconciliation phase, the team also offered supplemental advanced trainings on Detour to Solutions in SAIS as a part of the regional workshops and via two additional webinars. For the non-reconciliation phase, two webinars were offered.

During the spring, the Data Management team presented on the Annual Data Collection via two regional workshops, as well as targeted webinars geared towards novice users (four), advanced users (two), preschool transition (one), secure care facilities (one) and approved private schools (one).

Additionally, at the annual Directors Institute in the fall, the ESS Data Management team presented a session on Keys to Success in Data Management geared towards special education. This session focused on an overview of the three areas of data collection. A half-day session was also presented, in which the team walked administrative assistants through a typical full year of data collection.

Secondary Transition: Regional Training

During the 2014–2015 school year, Secondary Transition specialists provided a 1 ½-day training series on three topics and reached stakeholders in all Arizona counties. Topics for the training consisted of an introduction to the requirements of a compliant IEP secondary transition plan, alignment of the secondary transition plan with the Arizona Education Career Action Plan (ECAP), and a workshop to assist participants in applying evidence-based best practices in developing meaningful secondary transition plans for students with disabilities. Stakeholders included public school special and general education teachers, administrators, and local agency representatives that provide transition services such as vocational rehabilitation, mental health services, and the Division of Developmental Disabilities.

Secondary Transition: Technical Assistance for Individual PEAs and Private Day Schools

During the 2014–2015 school year, technical assistance was provided to individual public, charter, and approved private day schools on various topics related to the secondary transition planning process. Assistance was provided via campus and district visits, phone calls, review of plans, and in-person support on compliance and best practice for meeting Indicator 13 transition requirements.

Secondary Transition: Partnering for Transition

During the 2014–2015 school year, representatives from a number of state agencies provided information to participants on how to partner in transition planning. Panel members discussed their agencies’ unique roles in supporting students and families during their school and adult lives. Participants learned about eligibility requirements for each program, the type of services available, the agency’s role in transition planning, and how the agencies work together to support the needs of young adults with disabilities as they move from high school to adult living. This presentation provided information from agency experts representing the Division of Developmental Disabilities, the Division of Behavioral Health Services, the Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs, Arizona Rehabilitation Services Administration, Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, and Raising Special Kids.

Secondary Transition: Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA)

During the 2014–2015 school year, constituents and stakeholders were informed of the newly reauthorized Rehabilitation Act and the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), which now combines the two acts into one called the Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA). Attendees were made aware of the new youth and young adult requirements for youth and young adults with and without disabilities.

Secondary Transition: Employment First Initiative

During the 2014–2015 school year, the Secondary Transition team informed constituents of the message and strategic plan that guides education and agency staff to look at employment first for ALL students before considering other, more restrictive environments. The Employment First initiative has been included in all secondary transition trainings to provide guidance to staff working with students with significant disabilities.

Secondary Transition: Evidence-Based Practices: Predictors of Postsecondary Success

During the 2014–2015 school year, the Secondary Transition team introduced stakeholders to the Predictors of Postsecondary Success as identified by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). Information was provided to assist stakeholders in identifying activities related to these predictors that can begin as early as pre-school to help students begin to develop the necessary knowledge and skills that will lead to a positive post-school outcome. Participants reviewed their current practices and added new activities to facilitate development of these essential skills.

Secondary Transition: Understanding the Post School Outcomes (PSO) Survey: Data Collection, Analysis, and Use

During the 2014–2015 school year, training was provided for those who oversee or administer the Post School Outcomes (PSO) Survey. The PSO Survey, conducted one year after students exit high school, is required to be completed by districts and charter schools who serve students with disabilities ages 16 and over each year between June 1st and September 30th. Training included the requirements for the PSO Survey and how to incorporate suggested tips and techniques to insure the data collection was meaningful and results obtained were useful. Training was conducted via webinar, individual phone conference, and in person.

Secondary Transition: 2015 Transition Conference

Arizona’s Fifteenth Annual Transition Conference, *Connecting for Success: Shared Expectations, Responsibilities, and Outcomes*, was held at the Talking Stick Resort in Scottsdale, Arizona, in August 2015. This annual professional development event is unique for a variety of reasons: (1) participation is diverse and includes special education professionals and school-based transition specialists, agency providers, vendors, and exhibitors for transition services, and most importantly, youth and young adults with disabilities and their families; (2) session content includes information from national experts and researchers, but also puts a heavy emphasis on Arizona secondary transition “super stars,” such as homegrown school-based vocational training programs and local supports available for teachers and professionals; (3) and while ADE drives the coordination of this event, the Transition Conference Planning Committee spends all year making decisions and prioritizing content, activities, and supports. The Committee is composed of ADE, Vocational Rehabilitation, Division of Developmental Disabilities, the Office of Children with Special Healthcare Needs, Raising Special Kids, and PEA stakeholders.

Assistive Technology

Capacity Building Grant Series

AT Tech for Learning Communities

To lay the foundation for capacity building and systemic change in their schools, teams of educators known as Az-Tech grant teams participated in grant-funded training workshops in the fundamentals of

assistive technology (AT) and universal design for learning (UDL). At the end of the year, teams were better equipped to consider and implement AT tools and strategies to support students with disabilities and contribute to the training of other education professionals in their local education agency (LEA).

One-Day Trainings: iPads in the Classroom, Assistive Technology Assessment

Regional Trainings: Video Modeling

Technical Assistance (by phone or in person)

Individualized in-person and telephone assistance to support teachers and other school district staff in the selection and implementation of various assistive technology devices, tools, and software to support students in accessing the curriculum was provided. These technical support services included text-to-speech software, speech-to-text software, SmartPens, mathematics supports, math manipulatives, equation editors, physical access to the environment and academic materials, Google Chrome Extensions, iPad applications, and Android applications. Technical support also included specific research to overcome a specific barrier for individual students.

Chrome extensions

AT overviews

Training on items that schools borrow from the Lending Library

AAC support

Eye gaze

AAC apps

Switch access for iPads

AAC implementation

AT consideration

AT evaluation

AT for writing

AT for reading

AT for mobility

AT for executive function

Institute of Higher Education (IHE) Pre-Service Training: Assistive Technology in the Classroom: What Arizona Teachers Need to Know, AAC in the Classroom

ECAP/School Counseling

In the 2014–2015 school year, the Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP)/School Counseling staff offered these opportunities to educators:

1. In cooperation with the Career and Technology Education (CTE) section, staff created a new Workplace Employability Skills (WES) webpage, developed a variety of resources, and offered regional WES trainings. Conference sessions were also offered at a number of Arizona conferences. The goal was to have the Arizona Workspace Employability Skills in all high school classrooms.

Electronic surveys were sent out each time, and the results were available through ESS.

2. Site visits to provide technical assistance and discuss the school's Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP) process and documents were completed.
3. AzCIS (Arizona Career Information System) was provided free to all K–12 public education and charter schools that care to use it for their students' career and educational planning needs. A variety of venues were available for training needs: face-to-face workshops, regional trainings, school site trainings, and conferences. Additionally, a consultant-trainer specializing in career training from Oregon came to Arizona to provide trainings each semester.
4. Regional College and Career Ready trainings were provided for school counselors and school educators. The topics covered were: Civic Engagement; Workplace Employability Skills; Career and Technology Education (CTE)—Programs of Study; What Is College and Career Readiness for ALL Students?; Using the ECAP Planning Process and Resources for CCR; Community College Updates; The Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA); Using Your School College and Career Ready data to Make Change; Using AzCIS for ECAPs.
5. ADE staff, with external partners, offered trainings and conference sessions asking the question: *Do Students in Arizona Need 2–3 ILPs (Individual Learning Plans)?*

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Group members represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, and representatives from charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. The ADE/ESS personnel responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel's advice in selecting targets for the SPP.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR Target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The workgroup reviewed baseline and trend data for each indicator and determined appropriate targets. Input from all stakeholder groups was combined and considered in the State's selection of targets.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

The annual performance report (APR) on the State's progress and/or slippage for FFY 2013 is available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/> under the list titled Annual Performance Report. The title of the APR is *Arizona FFY 2013 Annual Performance Report*.

The annual public reports were available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/> under the list titled Public Reports School Year 2013–2014, within 120 days of the February 2, 2015, submission of the APR. These reports list the performance of each school district and charter school in Arizona on the SPP targets.

The SPP and APR are disseminated to the public by means of hard copy, email, and the ADE/ESS Web site. Each member of SEAP receives a copy of the SPP and the APR, as does Arizona's Parent and Training Information Center (Raising Special Kids). The ESS special education listserv, ESS and ECSE specialists, trainings, and conferences serve as the vehicles to notify parents, the PEAs, and the public of the availability of the SPP and APR. Special Education Monitoring Alerts, memoranda pertaining to specific topics including the SPP/APR, are sent to the field electronically on the ESS listserv and distributed by hard copy through the ESS specialists.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			62.50%	63.00%	64.50%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data		61.00%	60.40%	63.00%	64.00%	64.90%	65.80%	67.00%	65.00%	62.72%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. Input from all stakeholder groups was considered in the selection of all targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	4,734	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,474	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	63.34%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
4,734	7,474	62.72%	80.00%	63.34%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Arizona uses a four-year cohort to determine graduation rates: any student who receives a traditional high school diploma within the first four years of starting high school is considered a four-year graduate. A four-year rate is calculated by dividing the sum of all four-year graduates in a cohort by the sum of those who should have graduated and did not transfer to another qualified educational facility or did not leave to be home schooled or were deceased. Students who receive a diploma prior to September 1 of the school year following their fourth year are included as part of the four-year graduation cohort.

Conditions to Graduate with a Regular Diploma

Conditions students without disabilities must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma:

- Complete their PEA's requirements to receive a regular high school diploma (Arizona Revised Statutes § 15-701.01 (C) and Arizona Administrative Code R7-2-302);

Conditions students with disabilities must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma:

- The local governing board of each school district is responsible for developing a course of study and graduation requirements for all students placed in special education programs (Arizona Administrative Code R7-2-302 (6)).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

--

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.00%	4.90%	28.07%
Data		5.59%	4.20%	3.60%	7.50%	4.80%	4.66%	4.70%	5.90%	28.07%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	28.00%	27.90%	27.80%	27.70%	26.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. Input from all stakeholder groups was considered in the selection of all targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,597	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	9	null
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,470	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	25	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1,470	6,101	28.07%	28.00%	24.09%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

In accordance with a February 27, 2015, letter from the Director of ED’s Office of State Support, many States that implemented new assessments in the 2014-2015 school year are preparing to submit new AMOs for ED’s review and approval in January 2016. However, the ESSA requires States to “establish ambitious State-designed long-term goals...for all students and separately for each subgroup of students” instead of AMOs. ED wants to support State efforts to prepare for this transition; therefore, in accordance with ED’s authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, ED will not require States to submit AMOs (for school years 2014-2015 or 2015-2016) in January 2016 for ED’s review and approval, **nor will ED require States to report performance against AMOs for the 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 school years.** Additionally, ED will not require States to hold districts accountable for their performance against AMAOs 1, 2, and 3 under Title III of the ESEA for the 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 school years.

As a result, because the Department is not requiring States to submit AMOs for school years 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 or to report performance against AMOs for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years, States will not be required to report on Indicator B3A for purposes of the FFY 2014 Part B SPP/APR (due in February 2016) and the FFY 2015 Part B SPP/APR (due in February 2017). States will be required to continue to report on Indicators B3B and B3C in the FFY 2014 and FFY 2015 Part B SPPs/APRs.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.50%	97.00%	97.10%	97.60%	98.60%	97.40%	98.60%	98.60%	98.60%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			97.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.50%	96.90%	97.00%	97.50%	98.50%	97.30%	98.50%	98.50%	98.53%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this indicator are the same as the State's ESEA targets as given in the State of Arizona ESEA Flexibility Request dated July 13, 2012 (amended July 31, 2015), which is the current Arizona Accountability Workbook.

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

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

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

Reading assessment participation data by grade												
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS	
a. Children with IEPs	11713	11911	11297	10713	9963	9738	n	n	798	n	33161	

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5555	5218	5035	4878	4981	4784					14336
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4848	5434	5048	4582	3706	3660					3853
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1011	1017	1004	995	913	966			798		

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/23/1015

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	11709	11910	11296	10720	9998	9945	n	n	811	n	33144
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5578	5299	5049	5050	5052	5060					13379
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4941	5460	5086	4492	3795	3682					3120
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1011	1017	1004	995	913	966			811		

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	99,294	82,622	98.60%	95.00%	83.21%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona’s Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). Students in grades 3 through 8 will take an assessment in English language arts and mathematics at their grade level. Students taking high school–level English and mathematics will take end-of-course (EOC) assessments that will test their proficiency in these subjects.

The slippage in Group A can be accounted for by this change in Arizona’s assessment and the way it is administered. The previous statewide assessment, Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), was administered to high school students in the tenth grade year, and participation was calculated based on the tenth grade enrollment only. The new state assessment requires that EOC tests be given at the end of each of the designated courses to measure mastery of the standards taught in that course. With this change in assessment, the number of students in all high school grades is counted toward the State’s overall participation rate whether the students took the assessment or not.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A	99,533	81,760	98.53%	95.00%	82.14%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Overall					

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona’s Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). Students in grades 3 through 8 will take an assessment in English language arts and mathematics at their grade level. Students taking high school–level English and mathematics will take end-of-course (EOC) assessments that will test their proficiency in these subjects.

The slippage in Group B can be accounted for by this change in Arizona’s assessment and the way it is administered. The previous statewide assessment, Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), was administered to high school students in the tenth grade year, and participation was calculated based on the tenth grade enrollment only. The new state assessment requires that EOC tests be given at the end of each of the designated courses to measure mastery of the standards taught in that course. With this change in assessment, the number of students in all high school grades is counted toward the State’s overall participation rate whether the students took the assessment or not.

Public Reporting Information

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

The location (URL) of public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR § 300.160 (f) is <http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/aims-assessment-results/>.

The FFY 2014 Annual Performance Report (APR) gives information about the participation of students with IEPs. The APR is located on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/> under the list titled Annual Performance Report.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥						62.60%	71.90%	77.00%	80.00%	85.00%
			Data						36.30%	43.10%	40.60%	40.70%	41.55%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥						56.00%	67.00%	76.00%	56.00%	84.00%
			Data						34.10%	42.70%	41.50%	34.10%	41.18%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥						54.60%	65.90%	80.00%	54.60%	87.00%
			Data						30.30%	42.10%	39.80%	30.30%	42.29%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥						56.00%	67.00%	82.00%	56.00%	88.00%
			Data						33.20%	41.10%	40.80%	33.20%	41.45%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥						59.20%	69.40%	83.00%	59.20%	89.00%
			Data						31.00%	43.30%	44.20%	31.00%	50.74%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥						54.00%	65.50%	73.00%	54.00%	82.00%
			Data						26.70%	28.50%	29.80%	26.70%	28.33%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥						48.60%	61.40%	79.00%	48.60%	86.00%
			Data						31.00%	39.00%	38.90%	31.00%	47.56%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥						34.80%	40.60%	40.80%	72.00%	79.00%
			Data						53.00%	65.00%	69.00%	39.40%	39.43%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥						29.80%	35.10%	34.70%	70.00%	77.00%
			Data						50.00%	63.00%	66.00%	33.00%	30.62%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥						44.00%	58.00%	64.00%	68.00%	76.00%
			Data						24.00%	29.80%	28.90%	28.70%	27.87%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥						19.00%	22.90%	24.40%	68.00%	74.00%
			Data						43.00%	57.00%	61.00%	28.70%	24.08%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥						17.90%	23.40%	23.30%	67.00%	75.00%
			Data						44.00%	58.00%	63.00%	24.80%	24.39%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥						18.00%	17.90%	19.10%	61.00%	71.00%
			Data						44.00%	58.00%	56.00%	19.90%	20.68%
	G HS	2005	Target ≥						16.90%	21.00%	19.40%	67.00%	75.00%
			Data						48.00%	61.00%	63.00%	19.50%	21.31%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	87.00%	90.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	87.00%	89.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	91.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	85.00%	88.00%	91.00%	94.00%	97.00%
	G ≥ HS	88.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	83.00%	86.00%	90.00%	93.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	81.00%	85.00%	89.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	80.00%	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	78.00%	83.00%	87.00%	91.00%	96.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	79.00%	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	76.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	79.00%	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The targets are the mathematics and reading annual measurable objectives (AMOs) as given in the State of Arizona ESEA Flexibility Request dated July 13, 2012 (amended July 31, 2015), which is the current Arizona Accountability Workbook.

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

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

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

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	11414	11669	11087	10455	9600	9410	n	n	798	n	18189

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1305	1189	673	604	408	423					638
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	176	193	90	108	72	84					119
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	437	415	437	293	397	328			366		

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 42361

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	11530	11776	11139	10537	9760	9708	n	n	811	n	16499
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1468	1311	940	574	445	500					689
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	307	270	230	118	80	107					107
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	474	386	456	373	431	410			348		

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	11,414	1,918	41.55%	87.00%	16.80%
B Grade 4	11,669	1,797	41.18%	87.00%	15.40%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C Grade 5	11,087	1,200	42.29%	89.00%	10.82%
D Grade 6	10,455	1,005	41.45%	90.00%	9.61%
E Grade 7	9,600	877	50.74%	91.00%	9.14%
F Grade 8	9,410	835	28.33%	85.00%	8.87%
G HS	18,189	757	47.56%	88.00%	4.16%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group B Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group C Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group D Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group E Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group F Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group G Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	11,530	2,249	39.43%	83.00%	19.51%
B Grade 4	11,776	1,967	30.62%	81.00%	16.70%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C Grade 5	11,139	1,626	27.87%	80.00%	14.60%
D Grade 6	10,537	1,065	24.08%	78.00%	10.11%
E Grade 7	9,760	956	24.39%	79.00%	9.80%
F Grade 8	9,708	1,017	20.68%	76.00%	10.48%
G HS	16,499	796	21.31%	79.00%	4.82%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group B Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group C Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group D Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group E Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group F Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Explanation of Group G Slippage

In November 2014, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted a new statewide achievement test, Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). The results from the new achievement test are not comparable to the results from the previous test.

Public Reporting Information

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

The location (URL) of public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR § 300.160 (f) is <http://www.azed.gov/research-evaluation/aims-assessment-results/>.

The FFY 2014 Annual Performance Report (APR) gives information about the participation of students with IEPs. The APR is located on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/> under the list titled Annual Performance Report.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			1.55%	1.50%	1.40%	1.35%	1.30%	1.25%	1.20%	0%
Data		2.30%	1.87%	0.18%	0.18%	0.51%	0.34%	0%	0.30%	0%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other communications became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad group of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood education, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. The ADE/ESS responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice.

In addition to reporting on the APR to the SEAP, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State’s data collection and reporting process.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

-  Number of districts in the State
-  Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	613	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

Arizona uses Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to calculate rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs. Arizona uses the state bar method to determine significant discrepancy. The State rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with IEPs is 0.50%. The State bar, 5.50%, is five percentage points greater than the State rate.

A district or charter school has significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with IEPs is 5.50% or greater. There must be at least 50 students in the denominator of a suspension/expulsion rate for a district or charter school to be flagged as having significant discrepancy. The denominator represents the overall special education enrollment at the district or charter school.

Using the minimum “n” size of 50 students for overall special education enrollment, Arizona excluded 4 PEAs from the calculation (excluded 4 from 613) and used the total number of PEAs (613) in the State in the denominator.

Arizona compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs among PEAs in the State.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The 2013–2014 data were reported by the PEAs through the Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as the data reported under section 618, Table 5 (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for school year 2013–2014, which was submitted on November 3, 2014. The October 1, 2013, child count data are the same as the State’s data reported under section 618, Table 1, Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.

Note that the source of this data is from FFY 2013. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year because of the number of charter schools that may open and close from year to year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

The State reviewed the PEAs’ suspension/expulsion data and did not identify any PEAs with a significant discrepancy.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0.17%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1	0	613	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona uses Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to calculate rates of suspension and expulsion by race or ethnicity for children with IEPs. Arizona uses the state bar method to determine significant discrepancy. The State rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with IEPs is 0.50%. The State bar, 5.50%, is five percentage points greater than the State rate.

Any district or charter school that suspends or expels 5.50% or more of its students with IEPs of a given race/ethnicity for more than 10 days is flagged for significant discrepancy. There must be at least 50 students in the denominator of a suspension/expulsion rate for a district or charter school to be flagged as having significant discrepancy. The denominator

represents the special education enrollment at the district or charter school for a given race/ethnicity.

Using the minimum “n” size of 50 students for a given race/ethnicity enrollment, Arizona excluded 23 PEAs from the calculation (excluded 23 from 613) and used the total number of PEAs (613) in the State in the denominator.

Arizona compares the rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs among PEAs in the State.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The 2013–2014 data were reported by the PEAs through the Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as the data reported under section 618, Table 5 (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for school year 2013–2014, which was submitted on November 3, 2014. The October 1, 2013, child count data are the same as the State’s data reported under section 618, Table 1, Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.

Note that the source of this data is from FFY 2013. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year because of the number of charter schools that may open and close from year to year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

The State reviewed the PEAs’ suspension/expulsion data by race or ethnicity and identified one PEAs with a significant discrepancy. This PEA reviewed their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to determine if these contributed to the significant discrepancy.

Arizona required this PEA to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with all regulatory requirements prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. This PEA was required to resubmit the discipline policies and procedures for review by ESS program specialists to determine if they were in alignment with the requirements of 34 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536.

The practices of this PEA was reviewed by means of a self assessment. The PEA conducted an assessment of their discipline practices, which consisted of a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State’s monitoring forms. ADE/ESS specialists conducted on-site visits and/or desk audits during the self assessment to validate the decisions made by the PEA during the file reviews.

Upon the completion of this review, Arizona determined that the PEA was in compliance with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	63.00%
		Data		50.50%	52.30%	55.00%	56.70%	58.60%	60.00%	60.40%	62.00%	62.93%
B	2005	Target ≤			16.50%	16.00%	15.50%	15.00%	14.50%	14.00%	13.50%	15.00%
		Data		17.20%	16.20%	15.00%	14.90%	14.60%	14.80%	14.68%	15.00%	15.06%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.50%	2.30%	2.10%	1.90%	1.70%	1.50%	1.30%	2.00%
		Data		2.60%	2.70%	2.50%	2.70%	2.65%	2.60%	2.80%	2.00%	1.92%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%
Target B ≤	15.00%	15.00%	14.90%	14.70%	14.50%
Target C ≤	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	1.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State’s data collection and reporting process.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	116,428	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	74,106	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,174	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	2,016	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	91	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	296	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	74,106	116,428	62.93%	63.50%	63.65%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,174	116,428	15.06%	15.00%	14.75%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,403	116,428	1.92%	2.00%	2.06%

Explanation of A Slippage

Explanation of B Slippage

Explanation of C Slippage

The percent of students in the highly restrictive settings included in Measurement C is very steady in the State and represents

a small population with extensive needs and appropriate placements.

The majority of these students are placed by IEP teams in day schools where educational and behavioral needs can be met in specialized settings. A small proportion is placed in residential facilities or is educated in hospital or homebased environments.

Although slippage occurred, the ADE/ESS program specialists review least restrictive environment data on an annual basis with school administrators at each PEA in the State. If the PEAs data does not meet State targets for LRE, then the concern is discussed with the administrators.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									48.50%	50.00%
		Data								48.01%	49.80%	52.15%
B	2011	Target ≤									45.50%	44.80%
		Data								46.11%	44.81%	41.41%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	50.00%	50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%
Target B ≤	44.80%	44.60%	44.40%	44.20%	44.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State’s data collection and reporting process.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
--------	------	-------------	------	----------------

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	15,113	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	7,832	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	6,276	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	64	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,832	15,113	52.15%	50.00%	51.82%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,340	15,113	41.41%	44.80%	41.95%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2011	Target ≥						75.88%	76.38%		72.20%	80.00%
		Data					75.88%	81.39%	79.76%	71.70%	79.90%	78.85%
A2	2011	Target ≥						59.30%	59.80%		58.80%	63.30%
		Data					59.30%	70.13%	69.98%	58.30%	63.30%	61.98%
B1	2011	Target ≥						68.47%	68.97%		75.00%	79.00%
		Data					68.47%	82.02%	72.60%	74.50%	79.00%	77.44%
B2	2011	Target ≥						47.36%	47.86%		57.90%	62.00%
		Data					47.36%	69.76%	60.41%	57.40%	62.00%	60.53%
C1	2011	Target ≥						76.95%	77.45%		71.90%	76.20%
		Data					76.95%	75.54%	80.16%	71.40%	76.20%	78.22%
C2	2011	Target ≥						57.50%	57.90%		63.20%	67.00%
		Data					57.50%	61.85%	69.74%	62.70%	67.00%	64.12%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%
Target A2 ≥	63.30%	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
Target B1 ≥	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%
Target B2 ≥	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%
Target C1 ≥	76.20%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%
Target C2 ≥	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	69.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State's data collection and reporting process.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3043.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	166.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	354.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	695.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1231.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	597.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1926.00	2446.00	78.85%	80.00%	78.74%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1828.00	3043.00	61.98%	63.30%	60.07%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

In FFY 2014, the percentage of 3–4-year-old students included in the population increased again. This continued trend of an increase in the number of younger children included in the calculation could have attributed to the slight slippage in “positive social and emotional skills” area.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	178.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	379.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	681.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1257.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	548.00

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1938.00	2495.00	77.44%	79.00%	77.68%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1805.00	3043.00	60.53%	62.00%	59.32%

Explanation of B2 Slippage

In the area of “acquiring and using knowledge and skills”, a large increase was seen in the number of teachers and administrators completing the Teaching Strategies GOLD Inter-Rater Reliability certification. As reliability with using the tool increases, and accuracy in data gathering continues to increase, we anticipate fluctuations in the data as programs and teachers make adjustments and improvements to their data collection processes. This could explain the slippage in the area of acquiring and using knowledge and skills.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	248.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	344.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	524.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1192.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	735.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1716.00	2308.00	78.22%	76.20%	74.35%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1927.00	3043.00	64.12%	67.00%	63.33%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Since there was a significant slippage in the area of the number of children who substantially increased their rate of growth, time was spent analyzing the data more closely, and it has been determined that there may have been several contributing factors. One contributing factor was discovered when we evaluated Arizona’s Part C SPP/APR data: it was discovered that there was significant slippage in the correlating categories for Part C. Another contributing factor is the increase in the number of teachers and administrators completing the Teaching Strategies GOLD Inter-Rater Reliability certification. As reliability with using the tool increases and accuracy in data gathering continues to increase, we anticipate fluctuations in the data as programs and teachers make adjustments and improvements to their data collection processes. Both of these issues will be analyzed by the multi-agency Early Childhood Data Group collaborative hosted by ADE so solutions can be formulated.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather

data for this indicator.

Arizona uses the "Widely Held Expectations" report contained in Teaching Strategies GOLD. This instrument uses a uniform scale that presents scores for each area of development and learning. Using these scaled scores enables teachers to compare groups of children's scores across areas to determine which areas need additional attention and allows them to better understand each child as a whole. Specifically, the Widely Held Expectations tool assesses children in the areas of social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and mathematics as they relate to the requisite OSEP indicators. Expectations are defined as age ranges for children's development and learning. While typical progressions are presented for most objectives, they are not rigid requirements, and a range of scores exists for each area and age group.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	50.00%	60.00%	65.00%	55.00%
Data		44.90%	48.20%	90.00%	88.00%	85.00%	57.00%	60.40%	55.00%	60.20%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on parent involvement to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s policy advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Group members represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, and representatives from charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS personnel responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the SPP.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP;

In addition to the SEAP suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup that was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State’s data collection and reporting process.

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3335.00	3900.00	60.20%	57.00%	85.51%

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.

Every parent who has a child with an individualized education program (IEP) within the cohort of sampled PEAs has an opportunity to complete the survey using either the Web-based data collection system or a mailed-in paper response. Thus, within the cohort, a census of parents has the opportunity to complete the survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Valid and Reliable Data

Arizona ensures that the data are valid and reliable by offering extensive, ongoing technical assistance to PEAs. Initial survey instructions detail the steps that PEAs must follow to distribute survey instructions and confidential user codes/passwords to all parents who have a child with a disability. PEAs are given surplus user codes/passwords to have ready for the parents of transfer students. PEAs also receive guidance on how to maximize their parental response and involvement rates.

Table 8.1 Comparison of Parent Responses by Race / Ethnicity to State Special Education Population

Race/Ethnicity of Child of Parent Respondent	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Special Education Population (Child Count)	Percentage of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Hispanic/Latino of Any Race	1,529	39.08%	56,297	42.80%
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	3.96%	8,274	6.29%
Asian	60	1.53%	1,850	1.41%
Black or African-American	172	4.40%	8,297	6.31%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	24	0.61%	280	0.21%
White	1,673	42.77%	51,931	39.48%
Two or More Races	257	6.57%	4612	3.51%
Total	3912		131,541	

Note: 42 respondents did not indicate the race/ethnicity of their child.

Table 8.1 shows that the response rate by race/ethnicity is in alignment with the race/ethnicity of children in special education in Arizona for American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White racial/ethnic populations.

The response rates for American Indian or Alaska Native (3.96%), Black/African-American (4.40%) and Hispanic parents (39.08%) are lower than the State special education population data of 6.29%, 6.31%, % and 42.80 %, respectively. It is possible that the responses in the multi-racial category (which were self-reported as to race/ethnicity) and the responses that did not report ethnicity (which combined would account for 7.64% of the responses) may have been reported differently when other data-collection methods were used. Some of these variances in race/ethnicity responses may be affecting the percentage of American Indian or Alaska Native, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino participation. It should be noted that the percentage of respondents who selected the two or more races is significantly higher than the State race/ethnicity statistics for that group.

Table 8.2 Comparison of Parent Responses by Child Age Group to State Special Education Population

Child Age Group	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Special Education Population (Child Count)	Percentage of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Ages 3–5	517	13.22 %	15,113	11.49%
Ages 6–13	2,324	59.14 %	76,494	58.15%
Ages 14–22	943	24.11 %	39,934	30.36%
Total	3912		131,541	

Note: 128 respondents (3.27%) did not indicate the age of their child.

Table 8.2 shows the response rate is in alignment with the age group statistics for parents of children ages 3–5 and 14–22. The response rate is slightly lower than the age group statistics for parents of children aged 6–13.

As indicated below, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

Data Source

The data are taken from the Arizona Parent Involvement Survey. Arizona uses a 25-question parent survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The survey is the same survey as the one that has been used for past years and has not been revised

Data Description

The Arizona Parent Involvement Survey uses a Web-based data collection system to collect confidential demographic information and parental responses to the 25-question NCSEAM rating scale. A paper version of the survey is available in English and Spanish and in a large font in both languages. Parents complete the demographic data and 25 survey items. The data from the surveys are analyzed using WINSTEPS statistical software. Following NCSEAM guidelines, a threshold score of 600 has been established for a positive response to the item “The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.” The instrument measure implies that agreement with this threshold item indicates high likelihood of agreement with items located “under” it on the scale. A score of 600 is required for any parent’s survey response to be considered positive.

Sampling Procedures

Each school year a new cohort of PEAs is selected to administer the survey. The cohort is composed of PEAs:

1. a) in the assigned year of the ESS monitoring cycle, or
2. b) with a total student population of 50,000 or greater.

Every parent who has a child with an individualized education program (IEP) within these PEAs has an opportunity to complete the survey using either the Web-based data collection system or a paper response that is mailed in. Thus, within the

cohort, a census of parents has the opportunity to complete the survey. The ADE/ESS ensures all newly opened PEAs (typically, charter schools) are included in a cohort and administer the parent survey during that cohort year. The use of these procedures allows the State to meet the requirement to report on each PEA at least once during the SPP cycle.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	627	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Definition of Disproportionate Representation

Disproportionate Representation	Weighted Risk Ratio	Minimum n Size Target Racial/Ethnic Group	Minimum n Size Racial / Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services
Over representation	≥ 3.00	30	30

Methodology

The data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to produce a weighted risk ratio (WRR) that identified all racial/ethnic groups for all PEAs in the State. Data for over representation were examined. PEAs with a cell size of 30 or more students in the target racial/ethnic group and in the other racial/ethnic groups and that met the weighted risk ratio criteria for over representation were flagged for a review of policies, procedures, and practices by the State. PEAs with a lower cell size in the target groups were not flagged because false positives were identified as a function of the small number rather than as a result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. Arizona included the total number of PEAs in the State (627) in the denominator. Of the 627 PEAs, 11 were eliminated from the analyses because a weighted risk ratio could not be calculated for any racial/ethnic group.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**Arizona's Procedures to Determine if Disproportionate Representation Is the Result of Inappropriate Identification**

Arizona ensures that PEAs' policies, procedures, and practices are reviewed as required by 34 CFR §§ 300.173, 300.600(d)(3), and 300.602(a). The data are analyzed annually and PEAs may be flagged each year for over representation, according to the State's definition. When a PEA is flagged, then the policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA are reviewed annually to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures

On an annual basis, Arizona requires all PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR § 300.111, § 300.201, and § 300.301 through § 300.311 prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. Each year, if the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

Each year, if the PEA does not make any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must submit a Statement of Assurance that says: "The PEA has not altered or modified the policies and procedures implementing the State and Federal requirements for services to children with disabilities previously submitted to and accepted by the Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services. If the PEA proposes to alter or modify the policies and procedures previously submitted to the Exceptional Student Services, the PEA must resubmit the policies and procedures to the Exceptional Student Services for review and acceptance."

In addition, the PEAs that are flagged for disproportionate representation must submit their policies and procedures related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility to an ADE/ESS specialist for review.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices

On an annual basis, Arizona calculates the WRR for each PEA and uses the data as a trigger to flag PEAs with disproportionate representation. If a PEA is flagged, then an investigation of the practices is required to determine whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

Review of practices when a PEA is flagged for over representation the first year:

- The ESS specialist reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.
- The PEA conducts a self assessment of the agency's child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices to determine whether the *disproportionate representation* is a result of inappropriate identification. The self assessment consists of a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State's monitoring forms. The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the self assessments to validate the decisions made by the PEAs during the file reviews.
- Upon completion of the self assessments, the PEAs have the option to begin immediately revising their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility and to correct any noncompliance. No more than 60 days after completion of the self assessment, the ESS specialists then interview the special education administrators and review student files via on-site visits and/or desk audits to verify correction of instances of any noncompliance, including child specific, and to ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data.

Review of practices when a PEA is flagged for over representation for two or more consecutive years:

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the

ESS program specialist:

- o Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable, and;
 - o Validates the prior year's self assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the PEA is required to:
- Review current monitoring data, if applicable;
- Review the prior year's self assessment and describe the issues identified;
- Describe the steps taken to resolve those issues;
- Describe any current concerns regarding possible inappropriate identification;
- Describe the resources and technical assistance used to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and
- Review individual student files using the State's monitoring forms:
 - o The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the file reviews to validate the decisions made by the PEAs.
 - o The ESS specialists verify correction of instances of any noncompliance, including child specific, through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
 - o The ESS specialists ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data.

When Arizona makes findings of noncompliance as a result of the review of policies, practices and procedures, the PEA has one year from the date of written notification from the State to correct the noncompliance.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.80%	2.40%	0.35%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4	0	627	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Definition of Disproportionate Representation

Disproportionate Representation	Weighted Risk Ratio	Minimum n Size Target Racial / Ethnic Group	Minimum n Size Racial / Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services
Over representation	≥ 3.00	30	30

Methodology

The data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to produce a weighted risk ratio (WRR) that identified all racial/ethnic groups and six disability categories for all PEAs in the State. Data for over representation were examined. PEAs with a cell size of 30 or more students in the target racial/ethnic group and in the other racial/ethnic groups and meeting the weighted risk ratio criteria for over representation were flagged for a review of policies, procedures, and practices by the State. PEAs with a lower cell size in the target groups were not flagged because false positives were identified as a function of the small number rather than as a result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. Arizona included the total number of PEAs in the State (627) in the denominator. Of the 627 PEAs, 11 were eliminated from the analyses because a weighted risk ratio could not be calculated for any racial/ethnic group.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Arizona's Procedures to Determine if Disproportionate Representation Is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Arizona ensures that PEAs' policies, procedures, and practices are reviewed as required by 34 CFR §§ 300.173, 300.600(d)(3), and 300.602(a). The data are analyzed annually and PEAs may be flagged each year for over representation, according to the State's definition. When a PEA is flagged, then the policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA are reviewed annually to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures

On an annual basis, Arizona requires all PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR § 300.111, § 300.201, and § 300.301 through § 300.311 prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. Each year, if the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

Each year, if the PEA does not make any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must submit a Statement of Assurance that says: "The PEA has not altered or modified the policies and procedures implementing the State and Federal requirements for services to children with disabilities previously submitted to and accepted by the Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services. If the PEA proposes to alter or modify the policies and procedures previously submitted to the Exceptional Student Services, the PEA must resubmit the policies and procedures to the Exceptional Student Services for review and acceptance."

In addition, the PEAs that are flagged for disproportionate representation must submit their policies and procedures related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility to an ADE/ESS specialist for review.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices

On an annual basis, Arizona calculates the WRR for each PEA and uses the data as a trigger to flag PEAs with disproportionate representation. If a PEA is flagged, then an investigation of the practices is required to determine whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

Review of practices when a PEA is flagged for over representation the first year:

- The ESS specialist reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.
- The PEA conducts a self assessment of the agency's child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices to determine whether the *disproportionate representation* is a result of inappropriate identification. The self assessment consists of a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State's monitoring forms. The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the self assessments to validate the decisions made by the PEAs during the file reviews.
- Upon completion of the self assessments, the PEAs have the option to begin immediately revising their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility and to correct any noncompliance. No more than 60 days after completion of the self assessment, the ESS specialists then interview the special education administrators and review student files via on-site visits and/or desk audits to verify correction of instances of any noncompliance, including child specific, and to ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data.

Review of practices when a PEA is flagged for over representation for two or more consecutive years:

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the ESS program specialist:
 - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable, and;

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Validates the prior year's self assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the PEA is required to:
 - Review current monitoring data, if applicable;
 - Review the prior year's self assessment and describe the issues identified;
 - Describe the steps taken to resolve those issues;
 - Describe any current concerns regarding possible inappropriate identification;
 - Describe the resources and technical assistance used to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and
 - Review individual student files using the State's monitoring forms:
 - The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the file reviews to validate the decisions made by the PEAs.
 - The ESS specialists verify correction of instances of any noncompliance, including child specific, through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
 - The ESS specialists ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data.

When Arizona makes findings of noncompliance as a result of the review of policies, practices and procedures, the PEA has one year from the date of written notification from the State to correct the noncompliance.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.00%	84.00%	89.00%	92.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	98.24%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
249	248	98.24%	100%	99.60%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1
---	---

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.

FFY 2014 Noncompliance	
number of findings by incidence of noncompliance	number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/15/16
1	1

Arizona made 1 finding of noncompliance in FFY 2014. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, the single finding has been corrected as of January 15, 2016.

Range of Days Beyond the Timeline and Reasons for the Delays

Range of days	2
Mean	2
Median	2
Mode	2

The 2 days beyond the 60-day timeline occurred at a school district that complied with the parent request to reschedule the evaluation meeting due to illness. The evaluation was completed 2 days after the 60-day timeline.

Reasons Given for Delays

Unavailability of required personnel (parent, general education teacher, etc.)	1
--	---

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 11 are from the Arizona monitoring system. A public education agency (PEA) is selected for monitoring each fiscal year based on the results of a review of the agency’s data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations.

Data Collection

Data are collected from the PEAs during one of three types of monitorings:

- Independent — PEAs review student files focusing on Indicator 11. The ADE/ESS specialist validates the compliance calls. The student file forms are submitted to ESS for data entry.
- Guided — PEAs review student files and collect data for Indicator 11. The PEAs also focus on identified areas from the risk analysis and determine a root cause for poor performance. The ADE/ESS specialist validates the compliance calls. The student file forms are submitted to ESS for data entry.
- Direct — In addition to participating in EDISA or other on-site data activities, PEAs and the ADE/ESS review student files, and collect data for Indicator 11. The ADE/ESS staff input data.

The data that Arizona collects and reports for this Indicator include all children whose permissions to evaluate were received during FFY 2014 and for whom initial evaluations including eligibility determinations were completed during either FFY 2014 or FFY 2015.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data as it is collected, maintained, and reported through the State monitoring system. Training is provided to all ESS program specialists who monitor to ensure interrater reliability on compliance calls that are based on regulatory requirements. The ADE/ESS staff conduct trainings for PEA staff who will

participate in monitorings. The ESS specialists validate and verify the data through on-site visits or desk audits.

Evaluation Timeline

Arizona has established a 60-day timeline for initial evaluations. The Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) R7-2-401 (E)(3) states that the initial evaluation shall not exceed 60 calendar days from receipt of informed written consent. However, the 60-day evaluation period may be extended for an additional 30 days if it is in the best interests of the child and the parents and the public education agency agree in writing to do so (A.A.C. R7-2-401 (E)(4)).

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2014

During FFY 2014, a finding for Indicator 11 was issued when the line item for the evaluation timeline was found to be noncompliant. The finding was a written notification to the PEA by the State that the line item was noncompliant, and the finding included a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. The source of information on which to base a finding of noncompliance was an individual student file.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The ADE/ESS specialists reviewed the child specific files from the monitorings to determine that the PEAs completed the evaluation for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the PEA. The ESS specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits to determine that the PEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) related to the evaluation process in conformity with 34 CFR § 300.301 (c) (1).

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

The specific methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of noncompliance, including child specific noncompliance, and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on subsequent file reviews of updated data:

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify correction of all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific. The specialists reviewed the child specific files to determine that the evaluation was completed within 60 calendar days from the date of written notification of noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files and/or conducted interviews with the special education administrators during follow-up visits and/or desk audits to determine if all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific, were corrected and to ensure ongoing sustainability of the implementation of the regulatory requirements regarding initial evaluations.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		63.61%	82.40%	98.00%	93.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.15%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,561
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	370
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,082
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.	69
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	31

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	2,082	2,091	99.15%	100%	99.57%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	9
--	---

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

Account for Children Included in a, but not in b, c, d, or e — Reasons for Delays

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Late referrals from Part C	3
Failed hearing or vision screening	2
Shortage of personnel	2
Interruption of school schedule	2
Total	9

Each year since FFY 2009, the number of children not transitioned on time due to late referrals from Part C has decreased. Currently, in FFY 2014, 9 children were not transitioned on time due to late referrals from Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) as compared with 11 in FFY 2013, 9 in FFY 2012, 12 in FFY 2011, 21 in FFY 2010, and 39 children in FFY 2009. School districts are asked to submit an alert to the ADE/ECSE any time they receive a late referral from AzEIP that was not in category d (parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services) or category e (children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays). Each late referral from AzEIP to a district is reported to the State AzEIP office. The State AzEIP office provides technical assistance and follow-up to the local service-providing agency.

Similarly, if a local service-providing agency is reporting difficulty with a school district, the local agency issues an alert to the State AzEIP office. The ADE/ECSE provides technical assistance and follow-up to the school district. The ADE/ECSE and AzEIP maintain a shared database to track resolution of the alerts.

Challenges with the completion of hearing and vision screenings and the resulting follow-ups are an inherent part of evaluating young children, which at times causes delays in transition. Arizona has worked diligently to provide resources and facilitate collaborative efforts between Head Start organizations, school districts, and Part C agencies. This has helped Part C service coordinators encourage families to have regular hearing screenings.

Range of Days beyond Third Birthday

Range of days	4 - 238
---------------	---------

The 238 days beyond the child's third birthday was due to a late referral from Part C.

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

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

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 12 are reported annually by all public education agencies (PEAs) in Arizona that have children who transition from Part C to Part B. Data are included for the entire reporting year, from July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

Data Collection

The data are collected through the Annual Special Education Data Collection, an Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Web-based data collection system.

Valid and Reliable Data

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE)/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) unit assures the validity and reliability of the data as it is collected, maintained, and reported through internal edit checks. Training is provided to school personnel by the ESS Data Management Unit regarding the operation of the data system and interpretation of the questions that are components of the measurement. The State requires an assurance from the PEAs through the submission of a signed form attesting to the validity of the data. Random verification checks require that a selected district submit a copy of the front

page of the IEP that shows the date of the IEP and the child's birthday for children that transitioned from early intervention service or a Prior Written Notice (PWN) of children found ineligible by the child's third birthday.

Definition of Finding

A finding of noncompliance for Indicator 12 is defined as the number of PEAs with noncompliance. The finding of noncompliance is a written notification to the PEA by the State that the PEA is noncompliant.

FFY 2014 Noncompliance

# findings of noncompliance	# of findings corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/15/16
8	8

Arizona made 8 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, all 8 findings have been corrected as of January 15, 2016.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As specified in OSEP's June 2015 FFY 2013 SPP/APR Response, Arizona verified that each PEA with noncompliance reflected in the data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring; and
- has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local education agency (LEA), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

The specific methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of noncompliance, including child-specific noncompliance, and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on subsequent file reviews of updated data include the following actions:

- The ADE/ECSE specialists reviewed the written process and procedures for the PEAs' early intervention transitions,

including those that were collaboratively developed and agreed upon with AzEIP service coordinators.

- The ADE/ECSE specialists reviewed student data during subsequent visits and/or desk audits of updated data to determine if the PEAs corrected all instances of noncompliance, including child specific instances, and to ensure ongoing sustainability with the implementation of the regulatory requirements.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						90.00%	89.20%	78.00%	80.00%	89.51%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
244	273	89.51%	100%	89.38%

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

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

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

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidence of noncompliance	Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/29/16
29	4

Arizona made 29 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, 4 findings have been corrected as of January 29, 2016.

Data Source

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The data for Indicator 13 are from the Arizona monitoring system. A public education agency (PEA) is selected for monitoring each fiscal year based on the results of a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations.

The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Indicator 13 Checklist was used as a guide for the eight components that comprise the monitoring line item from which the data are pulled. The eight components are:

- Measurable post-secondary goals
- Postsecondary goals updated annually
- Postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments
- Transition services
- Courses of study
- Annual IEP goals related to transition service needs
- Student invited to IEP meeting
- Representative of participating agency invited to IEP meeting with prior consent of parent or student who has reached the age of majority

Data Collection

Data are collected from the PEAs during one of three types of monitorings:

- Independent — PEAs review student files focusing on Indicator 13. The ADE/ESS specialists validate the compliance calls. The student file forms are submitted to ESS for data entry.
- Guided — PEAs review student files and collect data for Indicator 13. The PEAs also focus on identified areas from the risk analysis and determine a root cause for poor performance. The ADE/ESS specialists validate the compliance calls. The student file forms are submitted to ESS for data entry.
- Direct — PEAs and the ADE/ESS review student files and collect data for Indicator 13. The ADE/ESS staff inputs data.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data as it is collected, maintained, and reported through the State monitoring system. Training is provided to all ESS program specialists who monitor to ensure interrater reliability for compliance calls according to regulatory requirements. The ADE/ESS staff conducts trainings for PEA staff who will participate in monitorings. The ESS specialists validate and verify the data through on-site visits or desk audits.

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2014

During FFY 2014, a finding for Indicator 13 was issued when the line item for secondary transition was found to be noncompliant. The finding was a written notification to the PEA by the State that the line item was noncompliant, and the finding included a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. The source of information on which to base a finding of noncompliance is an individual student file.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
47	47	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The ADE/ESS specialists reviewed the child specific files from the monitoring to determine that the PEA implemented the eight components of the secondary transition requirements for the children, unless they were no longer within the jurisdiction of the PEA. The ESS specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits to determine that the PEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) related to secondary transition in conformity with 34 CFR §§ 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b).

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

The specific methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of noncompliance, including child specific noncompliance, and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, based on subsequent file reviews of updated data:

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify correction of all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific. The specialists reviewed the child specific files to determine that the PEA implemented the eight components of the secondary transition requirements for the children, unless they were no longer within the jurisdiction of the PEA.
- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits to determine that the PEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) related to secondary transition in conformity with 34 CFR §§ 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b).

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥							14.05%		26.60%	26.60%
		Data						13.80%	13.60%	26.10%	19.60%	22.43%
B	2011	Target ≥							48.65%		60.20%	60.20%
		Data						48.40%	46.50%	59.70%	49.80%	57.08%
C	2011	Target ≥							71.10%		74.10%	74.10%
		Data						70.60%	68.50%	73.60%	66.90%	72.52%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	28.10%	29.60%	31.10%	32.60%	34.10%
Target B ≥	62.20%	64.20%	66.20%	68.20%	70.20%
Target C ≥	75.40%	76.70%	78.00%	79.30%	80.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel’s advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State’s data collection and reporting process.

FFY 2014 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	5410.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1249.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1929.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	455.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	344.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1249.00	5410.00	22.43%	28.10%	23.09%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3178.00	5410.00	57.08%	62.20%	58.74%
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)	3977.00	5410.00	72.52%	75.40%	73.51%

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data Source and Collection Methods

Beginning in FFY14, ADE/ESS changed from using a sampling method to a census methodology to collect post-school outcome (PSO) data. This represented a significant change to the sampling method used by ADE/ESS since the inception of OSEP mandated PSO reporting. ADE/ESS instituted “*Everyone Counts, Everyone In,*” to inform PEAs of the change and to facilitate the switch from a sampling to a census data collection methodology. PEAs were provided information on the state’s rationale for the change, as well as training and marketing materials designed to assist those PEAs who serve transition aged youth in the collection of post school outcome data annually, and thus allow for better results-driven analysis and improvement to secondary transition programs at both the state and local levels. OSEP was informed of this change.

During FFY14, 269 PEAs had leavers who met the criteria (youth with a current IEP who aged out, graduated, or dropped out) for participation in the PSO Survey. Of this number, 153 or 57% of PEAs that were required to participate in the PSO data collection had ten or fewer leavers while nineteen or 7% of PEAs had 100 or more leavers. A total of 7,882 youth statewide were eligible to take the PSO survey during the FFY14 data collection period. Of the 269 PEAs required to participate in the PSO, 260 (97%) met the requirement.

In order for PEAs to contact students for the PSO Survey, PEAs gather contact information on student leavers so they can contact these leavers the next year. Schools either input the data into the online PSO data collection system or maintain student contact information locally for use the next year. The PSO data collection system uses a secure application as part of ADEConnect, a secure single sign-on identity management system. The application includes an auto-population of student demographic information and exit reason imported directly from the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), a Web-based system for reporting all student-level details to the ADE. PEAs designate district or charter school personnel to contact student leavers or designated family members (i.e., parent, grandparent, or guardian), conduct phone interviews, and

input survey data into the online PSO data collection system. Youth or family members were contacted between June 1 and September 30, 2015, after they were out of school for at least one year.

Missing Data

Arizona’s PSO response rate for FFY14 was 69% (7,882 youth eligible for contact and 5,410 respondents). The FFY14 PSO Survey is missing data on 2,472 former students or 31% of the leavers. An analysis of missing data indicated that the largest segments of missing data were the result of two factors: either schools were not able to contact leavers after three attempts (1,229 former students or 50% of the missing data) or schools did not have correct contact information for them (792 former students or 32% of the missing data).

Selection Bias

Respondents to the survey were under-representative of the population of youth who dropped out of school, The State will continue to work with PEAs to identify strategies to encourage survey responses from youth in the dropout category and ensure that PEAs are collecting contact information while students are enrolled in school.

Response Rate

The FFY 2014 survey response rate was 68.6%. Arizona’s FFY14 census included 7,882 youth who were eligible to take the survey. (The total was adjusted for those who had returned to school or were deceased, or whose data were uploaded by the PEA to the SAIS system in error.) Interviews were conducted with 5,410 youth, young adults, or their family members or 68.6% of the leavers.

Representativeness

The ADE/ESS used the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Center to calculate the representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of (a) disability type, (b) ethnicity, (c) gender, and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout). This calculation determined whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP exiting school during school year 2013–2014. According to the NPSO Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of +/- 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under- representativeness of the group, and positive differences indicate over-representativeness.

Respondents were representative of all 2013–2014 target leavers based on gender, ethnicity, graduation status, and category of disability. As in previous years, youth who dropped out of school were underrepresented compared to the target leaver group. In FFY14 a -5.7% difference between respondents and the target leavers group existed. This represents a 1% decrease over FFY13 in dropouts being underrepresented. ADE/ESS will continue its efforts to increase response rates, especially among youth who drop out. Technical assistance and information highlighting tips provided in the NPSO guidance document for contacting hard-to-reach youth is provided to PEAs during PSO trainings and is also posted on the ADE/ESS PSO website.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			60.00%	63.00%	68.00%	70.00%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	65.22%
Data		57.90%	72.70%	68.20%	83.90%	44.70%	55.88%	44.83%	48.39%	65.22%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018			
Target	65.00%	-	75.00%	65.00%	-	75.00%	65.00%	-	78.00%	68.00%	-	78.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel's advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State's data collection and reporting process.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	11	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	21	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
11	21	65.22%	65.00% - 75.00%	52.38%

Explanation of Slippage

Arizona did not meet its target of 65 – 75% of the number of resolution sessions resolved through a resolution agreement. This slippage can be explained by the fact that although oftentimes matters are not resolved in a formal resolution session, these same matters are frequently resolved through private settlements between the parties after the resolution period. This is evidenced by the fact that of the 51 due process complaints, 42 were withdrawn or dismissed (with 4 matters being fully adjudicated at the time of reporting and 5 pending).

Looking at the due process data as a whole, although Arizona did not meet its targets with regard to formal resolution agreements and mediation agreements, overall, a majority of due process matters are being resolved without the need for a fully adjudicated hearing.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			82.50%	83.00%	83.50%	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%	72.22%
Data		82.00%	73.90%	70.80%	70.30%	85.71%	69.00%	82.86%	86.49%	72.22%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018						
Target	72.00%	-	82.00%	72.00%	-	82.00%	72.00%	-	82.00%	74.00%	-	84.00%	74.00%	-	84.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel's advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trained data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requested input for improving the State's data collection and reporting process.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	5	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	17	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	35	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
5	17	35	72.22%	72.00% - 82.00%	62.86%

Explanation of Slippage

Arizona did not meet its target of 72 – 82 % of mediation agreements related to due process complaints. Arizona has a cadre of eight qualified and trained mediators, whom the Arizona Department of Education trains annually. Of the 10 mediations held related to due process, five resulted in a mediation agreement. Of the five that did not resolve in mediation, one was still pending at the time of reporting, two were fully adjudicated in a hearing, and two resolved privately after the mediation.

Looking at the due process data as a whole, although Arizona did not meet its targets with regard to formal resolution agreements and mediation agreements, overall, a majority of due process matters are being resolved without the need for a fully adjudicated hearing.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		14.60%
Data	14.20%	0.69%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.69%	0.70%	0.74%	1.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel's advice in determining targets for the future.

The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were:

- To consider baseline and trend data for each indicator;
- To assist in determining appropriate targets for each indicator in which a target was required for the SPP.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Finally, ESS created an SPP/APR target workgroup, which was open to all ESS staff members. Input from all stakeholder groups was considered in the selection of all targets. The baseline and trend data for this indicator are based on the previous State assessment, Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS). In FFY 2014, Arizona is administering a new State assessment Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT). Stakeholders are aware that new baseline and targets will be set for this indicator as new trend data become available.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

[Arizona Part B Theory of Action](#) Arizona Part B Theory of Action

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Lisa Yencarelli

Title: Director of Federal Initiatives

Email: Lisa.Yencarelli@azed.gov

Phone: 520-628-6331