

**STATE BOARD ADVISORY PANEL  
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The Arizona State Advisory Panel for Special Education held a meeting at the Arizona Dept. of Education, 3300 N. Central Ave, 16th Floor, Room 104, Phoenix, Arizona, on August 21, 2017, 9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Members Present

Kristina Blackledge  
Lara Bruner  
Wendy Collison  
Ron Denne  
Susan Douglas  
Amanda Heyser  
Leanne Murrillo, Vice Chair  
Kathleen Puckett  
Justan Rice  
Heidi Sinkovic  
Christopher Tiffany  
Susan Voirol  
Nancy K. Williams, Co-Chair

Members Absent

Robert Gilmore  
Kresta Horn  
Wendi Howe  
Cathy Humphrey  
Paul Johnson  
Sophia Lenny  
Patrice Robinson  
Judith Shideler  
Mary Wennersten

Others Present

Alissa Trollinger, ESS/ADE  
Victoria Glock, ESS/ADE

Minutes Approved (As Read) (As Amended)

Chairperson:  9-26-17  
Signature Date  
 9/26/17

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
Call to order	Chris Tiffany, Co-Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.	None.
Call to the Public	Public comment guidelines.	None.
Purpose of the Meeting	Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) functions as an advisory panel to the State Board of Education, SEAP will be advising towards any changes to the current rules package (R7-2-401).	None.
Historical Perspective	January 2014 the Rules Committee was developed by the Arizona Department of Education created using the Leading by Convening Framework. The purpose of the rules committee was to examine the Arizona Special Education State Board 401 rules, to propose rules that are clear, constructive and align to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and provide guidance for implementation.	None.
Public Comment	Leanne Murrillo welcomed the public in attendance. She explained to those present the procedures for making a public comment. Anyone wishing to comment on an agenda item was asked to fill out a brief questionnaire stating which agenda item they wished to comment on. That person would then be called on when that item was discussed. Anyone wishing to comment on an item not on the agenda was asked to come forward at that time.	None.
Anna Branson	Ms. Branson stated continued erosion parent right to productively participate; concern of the deletion of suspension. Discipline remains to be a huge issue; an official (ACDL) response will be released by the 28 <sup>th</sup> of September.	None.
Craig Carter	Mr. Carter proposed SEAP/SBE to consider adding a rule of general education provision, as it relates to providing services to K-12 students suspected of having a disability and students with disabilities. The rule would be part of the child identification and referral section to grant general education intervention access; Public Education Agency (PEA) may develop and implement academic and behavioral instructional support services for students to engage in general education, implementation as designed for a period of time sufficient to determine effectiveness; determined appropriate by student and IEP team.	None.
Tina Kauffmann	Ms. Kauffmann stated concerning comments such as Arizona potentially losing IDEA funding, the reason Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) to be provided by specialist rather than special education teachers to make the most progress possible. Tina questioned the integrity of co-	None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	teaching as it relates to SDI being strictly provided by special education teachers.	
Daniel Gulchak	Dr. Gulchak concerns regarding identification referrals, evaluations and IEPs; he also referenced OSEPs communication regarding SB 1317 and would like the State Board of Education to streamline the process to reduce unnecessary burden on LEAs.	None.
Michael Remus	Mr. Remus spoke to the streamline of processes regarding SB 1317 which would align with federal regulations, and would like to see the process move forward within the legislature. He would like to see consistency regarding Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and would like to see SDI be provided by all individuals throughout the school system.	None.
Kimberly Peaslee	Ms. Peaslee stated Specially designed instruction allowed to be provided by qualified educators would allow children with disabilities access to specially trained professionals. She would like to fill the gap with the increase of special education students and decline of special education teachers.	None.
Susan Marks	Ms. Marks stated that parents want clarification and would like to know their rights, and would caution if seeking to eliminate paperwork; should not come at the expense of parents' rights. She would like for parents to have an equal playing field in this special education process which is complex, and would like to streamline and protect family rights.	None.
Heather Pierson	Ms. Pierson would like to eliminate the division between general education students and special education students. Regarding SDI, she would like to point out that certification standards include teachers to regularly design and modify the content for all students. Regarding the 15 school day request for an IEP meeting, in some cases, this could be resolved with a parent teacher meeting for a child not making progress.	None.
Review of Packet Contents Nancy Williams	Section B: Definitions, Section C: Public Awareness, Section D: Child ID & Referral, Section E: Evaluation/Re-evaluation, Section G: Individualized Education Program (IEP), Section H: Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Section I: Procedural Safeguards, Section J: Confidentiality, Section K: Preschool Programs, Section L: Private Schools, Section M: General Supervision, Section N: Procedural Requirements, Section O: Public Participation, Section P: Suspension/Expulsion	None.
Small Group Discussions	Panel worked in small groups.	Proposed changes were

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
		documented.
Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items	Next Meeting: September 26, 2017 Meeting Adjourned: 3:30 pm	None.

**SEAP- Small and Large Group Discussions**

Section	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section B: Definitions &amp;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Avoid duplicating IDEA regulations, if no further definition is listed; qualified professionals (10 – evaluator(s), 22 – qualified professional(s), 12- independent evaluation, 24 - reference back to statute</b></li> <li>Page 3 line 34 Screening – proposed vs. original definition, data cannot be used for special education eligibility: <b>first sentence of old, last sentence of new (subtract formal and informal)</b></li> <li>Strike Page 2 item 13; already defined in IDEA</li> <li></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section D- Child ID &amp; Referral (10:35 – 11:20)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with comments (page 5, line 6 – change to appropriate school based personnel, <b>line 1: ‘make available’ is appropriate; lines 19-24, strike identification, keep screening for possibilities</b>; please clarify or delete; page 6, line 7 – revert back to within 10 school days</li> <li>Page 4, D: Keep lines 37 &amp; 38, Page 5; line 6-9: maintain original wording; line 6 should be struck, 45 calendar days are appropriate; Page 6, line 13: not exceed one school semester</li> <li><b>Page 4: D1 28-34, no need to list, 35-38: agree last strikeout applies, practical to equal method, page 5 – make available, 6-9: change require to provide, each PEA personnel, maintaining documents, date be provided when the documents were provided to staff; 6: 45 days is appropriate; notification from parents, 33-37, strike; keep page 6: lines 9-13 strike, more procedural; page 6, line 1-3, strike; page 6 line 20, clarify the</b></li> </ul>

Section	Discussion
	process to include in item 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section E-Evaluation/Re-evaluation (11:55 – 12:40)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>60 day evaluation should mimic IDEA regs; page 8 lines 2 &amp; 3 – licensed physician assistant is not appropriate; #8: IDEA states clearly line 26-30 do not need to repeat;</b></li> <li><b>Item 3: initial vs re-evaluation, similar process for state; 60 day timeline, define starting point; strike line 8</b></li> <li><b>Page 7 line 15, should remain informed written consent; 15 days should be clarified; page 8 section A: general equivalency,</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section G- IEP (1:00 – 1:50)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Page 10 line 2-8: too much verbiage, line 10 – SDI, additional language might be added to clarify the specific provider, #5 line 21: state allowable accommodations/modifications, strike entire item 6, #7 line 34 15 school days of the receipt of the request</b></li> <li><b>#4 consider FAPE language, line 35: not to exceed 30 days</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section H- Least Restrictive Safeguards (2:10 - 2:25)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment &amp; Section I- Procedural</li> </ul>	

<b>Section</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Section J- Confidentiality</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Section K- Preschool Programs (2:30 – 2:50)</li> <li>• Section L- Private Schools &amp; Section</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• M- General Supervision &amp; Section</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N- Procedural Requirements &amp; Section</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• O- Public Participation &amp; Section</li></ul>	

<b>Section</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• P- Suspension/Expulsion (3:00 – 3:10)</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Final Comment Revisions (3:15-3:30)</li></ul>	