

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

**Arizona
FFY 2008 Annual Performance Report
for Special Education**

Submitted to the
Office of Special Education Programs
United States Department of Education

Educational Services and Resources Division
Colette Chapman
Exceptional Student Services
Deputy Associate Superintendent
602-542-4013
essdesk@azed.gov
www.ade.az.gov/ess

Revised April 8, 2010

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Table of Contents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development 4

Indicator 1: Graduation Rates 6

Indicator 2: Dropout Rates 12

Indicator 3: Assessments 18

Indicator 4: Suspension / Expulsion 36

Indicator 5: School Age LRE 44

Indicator 6: Preschool LRE 50

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes 51

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement 57

Indicator 9: Racial / Ethnic Disproportionality 64

Indicator 10: Racial / Ethnic Disproportionality by Disability 70

Indicator 11: Evaluation Timelines 80

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition 88

Indicator 13: High School Transition 94

Indicator 14: Post School Outcomes..... 97

Indicator 15: Effective General Supervision..... 99

Indicator 16: Complaint Timelines..... 121

Indicator 17: Due Process Timelines 123

Indicator 18: Resolution Session Effectiveness 126

Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements 129

Indicator 20: State Reported Data 132

Attachments 138

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report for Special Education

Federal Fiscal Year 2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

In accordance with 20 U.S.C. §1416(b)(2)(C)(ii) and 34 CFR §300.602, the State of Arizona must report annually to the United States Secretary of Education on Arizona's performance under its Part B State Performance Plan (SPP). The annual report is the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). The submission of the Part B APR, due February 1, 2010, reflects those requirements and the State's progress toward the goals established in the State Performance Plan submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in December 2005.

The February 1, 2010, APR gives actual target data and other responsive information for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. Also, the APR provides baseline data and targets for Indicator 7 using the SPP template.

The Annual Performance Report was developed by the staff at the Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) and the Arizona Department of Education/Early Childhood Special Education (ADE/ECSE). A number of Arizona Department of Education staff members with specialization in different areas examined improvement activities, collected and analyzed the data, and drafted the reports for the 20 indicators. Members of the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) reviewed data, indicators, and improvement activities and offered their perspective. Education personnel from the field also made suggestions.

Descriptions of the data, including sources, sampling methodology, and validity and reliability, are located under each indicator. Information is included which replies to the Arizona Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). All improvement activities were reviewed during FFY 2008, which led to the revision of some of the activities. The activities that were completed are updated.

Revisions were made to Arizona's FFY 2005-2010 State Performance Plan for Special Education. The document is available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/> in the Resources section, under the menu labeled State Performance Plan.

Stakeholder Involvement

As data and other communications became available at the close of the 2008-2009 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 revised the APR accordingly.

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. ESS program specialists spoke to administrators and teachers specifically about the 0% and 100% compliance indicators during on-site visits, seeking information for the revision of improvement activities to increase compliance.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Public Reporting and Dissemination

Arizona must report annually to the public on: 1) the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets in the SPP and, 2) the performance of each public education agency (PEA) in the State on the SPP targets.

The annual performance report (APR) on the State's progress and/or slippage is available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/> in the Resources section, under the menu labeled State Performance Plan, on February 1, 2010. The title of the APR is *Arizona FFY 2008 Annual Performance Report*. The revised State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2008 is available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/> in the Resources section, under the menu labeled State Performance Plan, on February 1, 2010. The title of the SPP is *Arizona State Performance Plan FFY 2005-2010 Revised FFY 2008*.

The annual public reports will be available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/> in the Resources section, under the menu labeled School Year 2008-09 Public Reports, within 120 days of the February 1, 2010 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 hard copy, e-mail, and the ADE/ESS Web site. Each member of SEAP receives a copy of the revised SPP and the APR, as does Arizona's Parent and Training Information Center. The ESS special education listserv, Parent Information Network specialists (PINS), 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 and PIN specialists.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Graduation Rates

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	64.5%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

# of students in 4-year cohort who graduated with a regular high school diploma	# of graduates in the 4-year cohort plus the # of non-graduates in the 4-year cohort	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
4554	7144	64%
$4554 \div 7144 * 100 = 0.637 = 64\%$		

Arizona did not meet the target.

Data

Data Source

The graduation data from Arizona's 2008 cohort were reported by the public education agencies (PEAs) through the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), a Web-based system for reporting all student-level details to the Arizona Department of Education.

Data Description

The graduation data were analyzed by the Arizona Department of Education's Accountability Division/Research and Evaluation Section (ADE/R & E) and the Information Technology Division (IT). The

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

same graduation rate calculation was used and it is the same data as reported to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA).

Valid and Reliable Data

The graduation data were obtained from the ADE Accountability Division/Research and Evaluation Section (ADE/R & E), which follows internal processes to ensure valid, reliable, and accurate data.

4-Year Cohort and Conditions to Graduate

Graduation Cohort Membership

Membership in a cohort class is established at the time of the student's first enrollment in the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) in a high school grade. It is computed on the typical four-year expectation for graduation based on the high school grade in which the student is first enrolled. The student's identity with the cohort class remains the same, regardless of student transfers, credits earned, time spent out of Arizona, time spent out of school, and the time necessary for the student to complete requirements for graduation. Graduation rates are used in the Elementary and Secondary Act Annual Yearly Progress determinations.

Conditions to Graduate with Regular Diploma

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

- The PEA's requirements to receive a regular high school diploma (Arizona Revised Statutes §15-701.01 (C)); and
- Achieve passing scores on the Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (Arizona Revised Statutes §15-701.01 (A)).

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

- The PEA's requirements to receive a regular high school diploma (Arizona Revised Statutes §15-701.01 (C)).
- According to Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) §15-701.01 (B), students with disabilities do not have to achieve passing scores on the Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) or Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards Alternate (AIMS A) to graduate with a regular high school diploma unless specifically required by the IEP team.

Explanation of Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona did not meet the 64.5% target for FFY 2008. However, the graduation rate for students with disabilities did improve by one percentage point to 64% over the FFY 2007 rate, and there has been a steady improvement for each of the past three years. Arizona maintains that quality transition planning for students from secondary to postsecondary education, training, and employment settings has positively impacted graduation rates for students with disabilities. To this end, the ADE/ESS transition specialists provided training and technical assistance to PEAs and adult service agencies; established community interagency transition teams; held a statewide conference dedicated to transition; and developed and disseminated information and materials through various media.

Transition specialists also analyzed data collected from on-site PEA technical assistance visits by ADE/ESS program specialists and targeted staff development to those PEAs most in need of training with regard to secondary transition requirements. Additionally, a pilot mentoring project was implemented to

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

assist PEAs with increasing capacity related to secondary transition requirements and better practices. Details of the Pilot Mentoring Project can be found in the improvement activities.

Further, ADE/ESS program specialists review graduation rates with PEAs on an annual basis as part of a larger data review that includes performance and compliance indicator data, PEA determinations, dispute resolution data, and annual technical assistance visit information. If a PEA has not met the State target for graduation rate, then the PEA may be required to conduct a drill down exercise that is designed to explore root causes.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Provide training to PEAs on effective transition services to increase graduation rate of students with disabilities	a) Develop a strategic plan to provide training and follow-up technical assistance to PEAs	<p>Plan development completed September 1, 2008.</p> <p>Plan includes ten main components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of Annual Site Visit Log (ASVL) to identify PEAs most in need of training and TA. 2. Provide training to targeted PEAs and in response to requests from non-targeted PEAs. 3. Review follow-up ASVL data to determine training effectiveness. 4. Organize Arizona's Ninth Annual Transition Conference focusing on improving post-school outcomes for students with disabilities by providing sessions on transition planning and dropout prevention. 5. Provide training to special education directors from across the State at the annual ADE/ESS Directors Institute. 6. Develop a pilot mentoring project in southern Arizona to develop a capacity building training model and materials to self-monitor and improve 	10/1/08 – 2/1/09	ADE/ESS Transition Specialists

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		<p>transition compliance and services for students.</p> <p>7. Provide capacity building grants to PEAs to facilitate intra/inter agency collaboration and build local capacity to improve post-school outcomes through local interagency work.</p> <p>8. Collaborate with national technical assistance centers and organizations including NSTTAC, NPSO, NPDC-SD, and the NASDE IDEA Partnership Community of Practice on Transition.</p> <p>9. Participate with other Arizona state agencies including RSA/VR, DDD, Department of Behavioral Health, and the Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs.</p> <p>10. Collaborate with other ADE sections (High School Renewal and Redesign, Career Technical Education, Dropout Prevention, and School Guidance Counselors) and ADE/ESS areas (Data Management, Program Support, and Parent Information Network).</p>		
	<p>b) Implement statewide plan for training and technical assistance to PEAs</p>	<p>Plan was implemented beginning September 1, 2008.</p> <p>All components of Arizona's Strategic Plan for Statewide Transition Planning were implemented and completed during FFY 2008. Activities were immediately implemented upon development, from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>Activities completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80 PEAs received training from ADE/ESS transition 	<p>2/1/09 – 6/30/11</p>	<p>ADE/ESS Transition Specialists</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		<p>specialists during the 2008-2009 school year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of ASVL data indicated significant improvement in compliance for PEAs who received training, with the most significant gains realized by PEAs participating in the Pilot Mentoring Project (all but one PEA in the pilot improved to > 90% compliance on reviewed transition requirements). • Arizona's Eighth Annual Transition Conference (September 2008) was held and offered sessions on compliance and better practices in transition, as well as provided sessions on dropout prevention from NDPC-SD staff. 678 people attended the conference. • Arizona's Ninth Annual Transition Conference (September 2009) was planned to include sessions on making data-based decisions to increase school completion rates for students with disabilities. A CD with presentation materials was planned to be provided to all conference participants and upon request by non-conference attendees. • 16 PEAs participated in the Pilot Mentoring Project, which proved effective and spurred the incorporation of the Pilot model into the redesign of the capacity building grant related to secondary transition (Secondary Transition Mentoring Project) for FFY 2009. 	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Intra and inter agency collaboration included all entities described previously in improvement activity #1 (a).		
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Dropout Rates

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	≤ 5.30%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

Note: Data reported is from 2007-2008.

# of students with IEPs dropping out of grades 9 – 12	# of students with IEPs in grades 9 – 12	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
2638	35112	7.5%
$2638 \div 35112 * 100 = 0.075 = 7.5\%$		

Arizona did not meet the target.

Data

Data Source

The dropout data were reported by the public education agencies (PEAs) through the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), a Web-based system for reporting all student-level details to the Arizona Department of Education.

Data Description

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The 2007-2008 data were analyzed by the Arizona Department of Education's Accountability Division/Research and Evaluation Section (ADE/R & E). It is the same data as reported to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act.

Valid and Reliable Data

The dropout data were obtained from the ADE Accountability Division/Research and Evaluation Section (ADE/R & E), which follows internal processes to ensure valid, reliable, and accurate data.

Definition of Dropout and Methodology

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate, Arizona used the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, Arizona used NCES' definition of high school dropout, defined as an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

The same definition and methodology for dropout rates apply to all students in Arizona.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

The data reported for FFY 2008 is a different set of data and was calculated differently as compared to FFY 2007 because the dropout rate measurement requires the same data as reported under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act. Slippage occurred due to using a different set of data, methodology, and calculation.

The ADE/ESS continued its work toward quality transition planning for students from secondary to postsecondary education, training, and employment settings with the focus on positively impacting dropout rates for students with disabilities. ADE/ESS transition specialists provided training and technical assistance to PEAs and adult service agencies; established community interagency transition teams; held a statewide conference dedicated to transition; and developed and disseminated information and materials through various media. The ESS transition specialists also analyzed data collected from on-site PEA technical assistance visits by ADE/ESS program specialists and targeted staff development to those PEAs most in need of training with regard to secondary transition requirements.

Additionally, a pilot mentoring project was implemented assisting PEAs in increasing their capacity related to secondary transition requirements and best practices. Details of the Pilot Mentoring Project can be found in the improvement activities.

Further, ADE/ESS program specialists review dropout rates with PEAs on an annual basis as part of a larger data review that includes performance and compliance indicator data, PEA determinations, dispute resolution data, and annual technical assistance visit information. When a PEA has not met the state target for dropout rate, the PEA may be required to conduct a drill down exercise that is designed to explore the root cause of data discrepancies.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Provide training to PEAs on effective transition services to increase graduation rate of students with disabilities	a) Develop a strategic plan to provide training and follow-up technical assistance to PEAs	<p>Plan development completed September 1, 2008.</p> <p>Plan includes ten main components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of Annual Site Visit Log (ASVL) to identify PEAs most in need of training and TA. 2. Provide training to targeted PEAs and in response to requests from non-targeted PEAs. 3. Review follow-up ASVL data to determine training effectiveness. 4. Organize Arizona's Ninth Annual Transition Conference focusing on improving post-school outcomes for students with disabilities by providing sessions on transition planning and dropout prevention. 5. Provide training to special education directors from across the State at the annual ADE/ESS Directors Institute. 6. Develop a pilot mentoring project in southern Arizona to develop a capacity building training model and materials to self-monitor and improve transition compliance and services for students. 7. Provide capacity building grants to PEAs to facilitate intra/inter agency collaboration and build local capacity to improve post-school outcomes through local interagency work. 	10/1/08 – 2/1/09	ADE/ESS Transition Specialists

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		<p>8. Collaborate with national technical assistance centers and organizations including NSTTAC, NPSO, NPDC-SD, and the NASDE IDEA Partnership Community of Practice on Transition.</p> <p>9. Participate with other Arizona state agencies including RSA/VR, DDD, Department of Behavioral Health, and the Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs.</p> <p>10. Collaborate with other ADE sections (High School Renewal and Redesign, Career Technical Education, Dropout Prevention, and School Guidance Counselors) and ADE/ESS areas (Data Management, Program Support, and Parent Information Network).</p>		
	<p>b) Implement statewide plan for training and technical assistance to PEAs</p>	<p>Plan was implemented beginning September 1, 2008.</p> <p>All components of Arizona's Strategic Plan for Statewide Transition Planning were implemented and completed during FFY 2008. Activities were immediately implemented upon development, from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>Activities completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80 PEAs received training from ADE/ESS transition specialists during the 2008-2009 school year. • Review of ASVL data indicated significant improvement in compliance for PEAs who received training, with the most significant gains realized by PEAs participating in the Pilot Mentoring Project (all 	<p>2/1/09 – 6/30/11</p>	<p>ADE/ESS Transition Specialists</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		<p>but one PEA in the pilot improved to > 90% compliance on reviewed transition requirements).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arizona’s Eighth Annual Transition Conference (September 2008) was held and offered sessions on compliance and better practices in transition, as well as provided sessions on dropout prevention from NDPC-SD staff. 678 people attended the conference. • Arizona’s Ninth Annual Transition Conference (September 2009) was planned to include sessions on making data-based decisions to increase school completion rates for students with disabilities. A CD with presentation materials was planned to be provided to all conference participants and upon request by non-conference attendees. • 16 PEAs participated in the Pilot Mentoring Project, which proved effective and spurred the incorporation of the Pilot model into the redesign of the capacity building grant related to secondary transition (Secondary Transition Mentoring Project) for FFY 2009. • Intra and inter agency collaboration included all entities described previously in improvement activity #1 (a). 	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Assessments

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 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))

Measurement

A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.

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

C. Proficiency rate percent = ((# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

Data

Data Source

The assessment data were from Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) and Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards Alternate (AIMS A).

Data Description

The assessment data were analyzed by the Arizona Department of Education's Accountability Division/Research and Evaluation Section (ADE/R & E) and the Information Technology Division (IT). It is the same data as reported to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act.

The AIMS and AIMS A data were used for determining AYP and for reporting participation and performance. The grades tested for FFY 2008 were 3 through 8 and grade 10. The State uses four categories for the proficiency status:

- Falls Far Below the Standard (F)
- Approaches the Standard (A)
- Meets the Standard (M)
- Exceeds the Standard (E)

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Students who met the standard (M) or exceeded the standard (E) were counted as proficient.

Valid and Reliable Data

The assessment data were obtained from the ADE Accountability Division/Research and Evaluation Section and the Information Technology Division (IT), which follows internal processes to ensure valid, reliable, and accurate data. The ADE Standards and Assessment Division/Assessment Section ensure its assessments adhere to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.

3.A — AYP Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	24.5%

3.A — Actual AYP Target Data for FFY 2008

Year	Total Number of PEAs	Number of PEAs Meeting the “n” Size	Number of PEAs that Meet the Minimum “n” Size and Met AYP for FFY 2008	Percent of PEAs
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	577	75	4	5.33%

Arizona did not meet the target for 3.A. for AYP.

3.B — Target Data for Mathematics and Reading Participation for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
2008	Mathematics 95%	Reading 95%

3.B — Actual Disaggregated Target Data for Mathematics Participation for FFY 2008

Statewide Assessment		Mathematics Assessment Participation								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	Total	
2008-2009									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	11387	11542	11299	10687	10129	9981	8134	73159	NA

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5655	4891	4469	4310	4281	4475	3712	31793	43.5%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4721	5622	5892	5446	4822	4427	3305	34235	46.8%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	791	813	742	731	731	771	711	5290	7.2%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	11167	11326	11103	10487	9834	9673	7728	71318	97.5%
Children included in a but not included in the other counts above										
	Children with IEPs who were not participants were absent or had invalid scores.	220	216	196	200	295	308	406	1841	2.5%

Arizona met the target for 3.B for the mathematics participation rate.

3.B — Actual Disaggregated Target Data for Reading Participation for FFY 2008

Statewide Assessment 2008-2009		Reading Assessment Participation								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	Total	
									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	11387	11542	11299	10687	10129	9982	8223	73249	NA
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5656	4891	4475	4313	4288	4478	3851	31952	43.6%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4726	5637	5892	5446	4833	4420	3211	34165	46.6%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	against grade-level standards									
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	791	813	742	731	731	771	711	5290	7.2%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	11173	11341	11109	10490	9852	9669	7773	71407	97.6%
Children included in a but not included in the other counts above										
	Children with IEPs who were not participants were absent or had invalid scores.	214	201	190	197	277	313	450	1842	2.4%

Arizona met the target for 3.B for the reading participation rate.

3.C — Target Data for Mathematics and Reading Proficiency for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
2008	Mathematics 45%	Reading 50%

3.C — Actual Disaggregated Target Data for Mathematics Proficiency for FFY 2008

Statewide Assessment 2008-2009		Mathematics Assessment Proficiency								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	Total	
									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	9864	9979	9783	9160	8473	8353	6641	62253	NA
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2947	2647	2148	1504	1490	1136	724	12596	20.2%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1202	1250	1130	788	829	444	538	6181	9.9%

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	469	472	425	412	443	450	470	3141	5.0%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	4618	4369	3703	2704	2762	2030	1732	21918	35.2%

Arizona did not meet the target for 3.C for the mathematics proficiency rate.

3.C — Actual Disaggregated Target Data for Reading Proficiency for FFY 2008

Statewide Assessment 2008-2009		Reading Assessment Proficiency								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	Total	
									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	9865	9987	9785	9165	8488	8349	6757	62396	NA
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2754	2520	2113	1638	1480	1290	1009	12804	20.5%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	697	911	1009	834	812	561	747	5571	8.9%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	457	457	426	416	449	507	511	3223	5.2%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	3908	3888	3548	2888	2741	2358	2267	21598	34.6%

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Arizona did not meet the target for 3.C for the reading proficiency rate.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona did not meet the target for Indicator 3.A (AYP); there was a slight slippage of 0.1%. Student participation (3.B) in both the mathematics and reading assessments grew by a small amount from FFY 2007, from 97% to 97.5% and 97.6%, respectively.

Although the targets were not met for mathematics and reading proficiency (3.C), there were gains in both subject areas. Mathematics proficiency increased to 35.2% from 29.9%; reading proficiency rose to 34.6% from 29.02%.

The ADE/ESS sponsors two programs in mathematics and reading related to student proficiency. The programs, Arizona Students Achieving Mathematics Academy (ASAMA) and Systemic Change in Reading (SCR), target PEAs making little or no progress on proficiency measures and with meeting AYP. Both programs provide research-based interventions and strategies to educators.

One of the major goals of ASAMA is to improve the mathematics content knowledge of both teachers and principals. The teams use the professional learning community model to bring about instructional changes through professional development and school-wide plans and practices. Both teachers and principals practice the strategies in the classrooms. Immediate feedback is provided by ESS and the ASAMA presenter on each team's implementation through a Team Implementation Portfolio, which compiles information such as data analysis and homework completed by the groups.

The ASAMA presenter and ESS are developing new data tools to collect and analyze the outcomes of this program on student proficiency. As the project continues, they are improving the content of the math academies based on the data collected, feedback received from participants, and new research.

The SCR (reading) training focuses on the five components in reading (phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary strategies) and on how to use data to drive instruction. A team implementation portfolio has been developed to monitor each school's progress toward implementation of the model with fidelity. Data will be collected and analyzed in a different manner (see revised improvement activity) to determine the effect of this program on student proficiency.

The math and reading improvement activities are designed to track progress of the individual schools during the two-year training programs. Data are collected during these two years, as noted in the activities. Final proficiency scores will be collected and reported at the end of the projected timeline.

The ESS assistive technology (AT) team also worked directly with school personnel and parents. Assistive technology items successfully used in classroom instruction and included in the IEP may then be used by students during assessments. The AT specialists provided information about devices and software, classroom implementation strategies, and the ADE/ESS AT lending library program.

The ADE/ESS contracts for and funds an AT lending library program. PEAs can utilize this service to borrow assistive technology tools, devices, and software for a four-week period, free of cost. This allows teachers and students to trial different forms of technology and software to assess student success in accessing and benefiting from the general education curriculum in the classroom before an item is purchased by the PEA. Information about the lending library information is on the internet at adeatloan@nau.edu.

The AT team collaborated with the Alternate Assessment (AA) unit to research technology access options, assisting in the determination of appropriate student access modes for the AIMS A assessment. In an effort to increase awareness of accessibility options for the AA unit, the AT team demonstrated

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

common technology and software choices used by students. It was found that appropriate access could be gained through utilization of text-to-speech software, as well as scanning and mouse movement technology, both traditional and alternative.

Recommendations concerning implementation strategies for the online test version were provided to the AA unit during the programming phase of the redevelopment of the AIMS A instrument. The AT team worked with the AA unit to generate a visual presentation of test content utilizing Boardmaker, a symbol-based literacy software package designed to create text paired with visual supports of narrative selections. AIMS A test content was redesigned in a format proven to provide optimal access to students, which also assured visual and textual consistency for test items.

In an effort to support the effective administration of the AIMS A assessment, the AT team plans, develops, and implements training sessions for PEAs that include information about specific software, devices, and tools used by students in the classroom to access and benefit from the general education curriculum. Training sessions also provide information about strategies for inclusion of assistive technology in the IEP, utilization of specific software and devices, and methodology for selecting assistive technology for student use.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Revised, with Justification, for FFY 2008

Mathematics: As ESS reviewed the improvement activities (below) for Arizona Students Achieving Mathematics Academy (ASAMA), it was determined that revised improvement activities (see Revisions) would better measure the ASAMA teams' progress toward helping students reach higher levels of mathematics achievement.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Year 1 – 100% of Arizona Students Achieving Mathematics Academy (ASAMA) Year 1 and 2 teams will increase mathematics proficiency rate to 50% in the number strand for students with IEPs as determined by AIMS third grade data	a) 100% of ASAMA teachers will implement number and number operation strategies for all students including students with disabilities as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teachers provided student work samples at each session as evidence of scientifically-based number strand strategies. The teams engaged in a reflection process facilitated by an ASAMA coach that captured the essence of what occurred in the classrooms. The ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist provided feedback to participants through oral discussions. For the 2009-2010 school year,</p>	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p> <p>Cognitively Guided Instruction</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		an engagement form was developed along with a team implementation portfolio to collect concrete qualitative data on their implementation processes.		
	b) 100% of ASAMA teams will demonstrate the ability to develop a lesson outline utilizing Arizona Mathematics Standard objectives with the Star framework (ASAMA's model that demonstrates five strategies to differentiate math lessons) as determined by Star Model entry points	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA team teachers provided number strand Star Model lesson idea samples. The ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist provided feedback to participants through oral discussions. For the 2009-2010 school year, a team implementation portfolio was developed to provide feedback and a means of collecting Star Model lessons.</p>	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
2) Year 2 – 100% of ASAMA Year 1 and 2 teams will increase mathematics proficiency rate to 50% in the data analysis/probability/discrete math, algebra/patterns/functions, geometry/measurement, and structure/logic strands for students with IEPs as determined by AIMS third grade data	a) 100% of ASAMA teachers will implement data analysis/probability/discrete math, algebra/patterns/functions, geometry/measurement, and structure/logic strategies for all students including students with disabilities as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teachers provided student work samples at each session as evidence of scientifically-based data analysis/probability/discrete math, algebra/patterns/functions, geometry/measurement, and structure/logic strand strategies. The teams engaged in a reflection process facilitated by an ASAMA coach that captured the level of implementation by describing what occurred</p>	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p> <p>Cognitively Guided Instruction</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		in the classrooms. The ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist provided feedback to participants through oral discussions. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed along with a team implementation portfolio to collect concrete qualitative data on their implementation processes.		
	b) 100% of ASAMA teams will demonstrate the ability to develop a lesson outline utilizing Arizona Mathematics Standard objectives with the Star framework as determined by Star Model entry points	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA team teachers provided data analysis/probability/discrete math, algebra/patterns/functions, geometry/measurement, or structure/logic strands Star Model lesson idea samples. The ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist provided feedback to participants through oral discussions. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed along with a team implementation portfolio to collect concrete evidence of completion of the Star Model lessons.</p>	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	c) 100% of ASAMA teams will develop a professional learning community plan to maintain sustainability of mathematics instruction as determined by professional learning community criteria	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teams formed Professional Learning</p>	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		Community (PLC) entities at the school site. The PLC meetings were conducted monthly. The CSPD math specialist conducted site visits during the course of the school year to verify team participation in the PLC. Through the PLC process, teams formed action plans to bring about change in mathematics instruction. These action plans were reviewed and discussed during the PLC meetings with the CSPD math specialist.		
3) Year 1 and 2 - 100% of ASAMA Year 1 and 2 teams will increase or maintain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as indicated by third grade AIMS data for the disability subgroup	a) 100% of ASAMA teachers will implement number and number operation strategies for all students including students with disabilities as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teachers provided student work samples at each training session as evidence of scientifically-based number strand strategies. The teams engaged in a reflection process facilitated by an ASAMA coach that captured the essence of what occurred in the classrooms. The ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist provided feedback to participants through oral discussions. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed along with a team implementation portfolio to collect concrete qualitative data on implementation processes.</p>	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p> <p>Cognitively Guided Instruction</p>
	b) 100% of ASAMA teachers will	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p>		

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	<p>implement data analysis/probability/discrete math, algebra/patterns/functions, geometry/measurement, and structure/logic strategies for all students including students with disabilities as determined by student work</p>	<p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teachers provided student work samples at each session as evidence of scientifically-based data analysis/ probability/ discrete math, algebra/patterns/functions , geometry/measurement, and structure/logic strand strategies. The teams engaged in a reflection process facilitated by an ASAMA coach that captured the essence of what occurred in the classrooms. The ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist provided feedback to participants through oral discussions. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed, along with a team implementation portfolio, to collect concrete qualitative data on implementation processes.</p>		<p>System of Personnel Development Staff</p> <p>Cognitively Guided Instruction</p>
	<p>c) 100% of ASAMA teachers will use fact automaticity assessment data to determine mathematical strategy instruction of basic facts for all students including students with IEPs as determined by screening and progress monitoring graph data</p>	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teams implemented a fact automaticity screen to assess the needs of students.</p>	<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/11</p>	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p>
	<p>d) 100% of ASAMA teachers will demonstrate ability to develop a classroom learning station plan based on screening</p>	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p>	<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/10</p>	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	<p>data as determined by learning station criteria</p>	<p>100% of the ASAMA teachers used screening data to determine small groups for intervention and create a learning station plan. Learning station forms were reviewed by the ASAMA presenter and the CSPD math specialist. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed, along with a team notebook, to collect concrete data of participant implementation and to receive written feedback.</p>		
	<p>e) 100% of ASAMA teachers will demonstrate ability to develop a Student, Environment, Task, Technology (SETT) plan for one student as determined by the SETT framework criteria</p>	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA teachers submitted one SETT form. They were visually checked by the CSPD math specialist. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed, along with a team notebook, to collect concrete data of participant implementation and to receive written feedback. It was also determined that the SETT presenter would review each form and provide in-depth feedback to the participants.</p>	<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/10</p>	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p>
	<p>f) 100% of ASAMA teams will demonstrate ability to develop an action plan to improve mathematics instruction for all students including</p>	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the ASAMA</p>	<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/11</p>	<p>Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	students with IEPs as determined by action plan criteria	teams submitted an action plan. The action plans were reviewed by the CSPD math specialist and returned to the teams. The action plans are considered a living document that evolves as the team acquires new learning. For the 2009-2010 school year, an engagement form was developed along with a team notebook to collect concrete data of participant implementation and to receive written feedback.		
--	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Reading: After ESS reviewed the report and data from FFY 2008 for Systemic Change in Reading (SCR), it was determined that the same data was collected at several points due to repetition of the sub-activities within the improvement activities (below). The improvement activities were revised (see Revisions) to condense the sub-activities and analyze the data by strands within the Arizona Academic Standards.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Year 1 and 2 – Systemic Change in Reading (SCR) teams will increase proficiency rate to 50% for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards as determined by AIMS	a) 100% of Systemic Change in Reading Year 2 will increase reading proficiency rate to 50% in comprehension and vocabulary for students with IEPs as determined by AIMS third grade data	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and revised (see revisions below). 100% of the Year 2 teams received instructional strategies to address comprehension and vocabulary. Among year 2 teams, 26% attained 50% proficiency rate. Among Year 1 teams, 14% showed an increase in proficiency rate.	6/1/08 – 6/30/11	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	b) 100% of Systemic Change in Reading teachers will analyze classroom data to determine instructional needs for all students including students with IEPs as determined by	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and revised (see revisions below). 100% of the Year 1 and 2	6/1/08 – 6/30/11	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	curriculum-based measurement data	teams received instruction in analyzing classroom data and received training in how to meet the needs of individual students based on the data. For the 2009-2010 school year, a team notebook was developed to collect concrete data of participant implementation and to receive written feedback from the CSPD reading specialist and the SCR presenter.		
2) Year 1 – 100% of Systemic Change in Reading Year 1 teams will increase reading proficiency rate to 50% in phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency for students with IEPs as determined by AIMS third grade data	a) 100% of Systemic Change in Reading teachers will implement phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency strategies for all students including students with IEPs as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the Year 1 teams received instruction in phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency strategies for implementation in the classroom. 29% of the schools showed an increase of the average student score in the Falls Far Below category, 43% in the Approaches category, and 43% in the Meets category in each of these areas.</p>	6/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	b) 100% of Systemic Change in Reading teachers will implement phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency strategies of differentiated instructional practices for all students and accommodations and modifications for students with IEPs as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the Year 1 teams received training in differentiated instruction, accommodations, and modifications in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency.</p>		

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		For the 2009-2010 school year, a team notebook was developed to collect concrete data of participant implementation and to receive written feedback from the CSPD reading specialist and the SCR presenter.		
3) Year 2 - 100% of Systemic Change in Reading Year 2 teams will increase reading proficiency rate to 50% in comprehension and vocabulary for students with IEPs as determined by AIMS third grade data	a) 100% of Systemic Change in Reading teachers will implement comprehension and vocabulary strategies for all students including students with IEPs as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the Year 2 teams received training in comprehension and vocabulary strategies. 27% of the schools showed an increase in proficiency rate in these areas.</p>	6/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	b) 100% of Systemic Change in Reading teachers will implement comprehension and vocabulary strategies of differentiated instructional practices for all students and accommodations and modifications for students with IEPs as determined by student work	<p>Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09.</p> <p>This activity completed and revised (see revisions below).</p> <p>100% of the Year 2 teams received training in differentiated instruction, accommodations, and modifications in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency. For the 2009-2010 school year, a team notebook was developed to collect concrete data of participant implementation and to receive written feedback from the CSPD reading specialist and the SCR presenter.</p>		

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Mathematics: The following are revised improvement activities for the Arizona Students Achieving Mathematics Academy (ASAMA) project. As ESS reviewed the current improvement activities, it was determined that revised activities (below) would better measure the ASAMA teams' progress toward helping students reach higher levels of mathematics achievement.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) By the end of Year 1, teams will increase mathematics proficiency rate for students with IEPs, as determined by third grade AIMS data.	a) Provide mathematics training in number, operations, structure, and logic through the Arizona Students Achieving Mathematics Academy (ASAMA).		9/1/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff
	b) Collect and analyze third grade AIMS data by strand.		9/1/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff
2) By the end of Year 2, teams will increase mathematics proficiency rate for students with IEPs, as determined by third grade AIMS data.	a) Provide mathematics training in connecting number and operations to data analysis/probability/discrete math strand, algebra/patterns/functions strand, geometry/measurement strand, and structure/logic strand through the Arizona Students Achieving Mathematics Academy.		9/1/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff
	b) Collect and analyze third grade AIMS data by strand.		9/1/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff
3) By the end of Year 1 and 2, teams will increase mathematics proficiency rate for students with IEPs, as determined by third grade AIMS data.	a) Provide training in the use of SETT (Student, Environment, Task, Tools) Process and the Star Model to improve accessibility of mathematics and enhance mathematics instruction.		9/1/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff
	b) Provide training in creating a professional learning community that will		9/1/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	help teams collaborate, analyze data, make instructional decisions, continue learning and/ or create a school-wide professional development plan.			
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reading: The following are revised improvement activities for the Systemic Change in Reading (SCR) project. After ESS reviewed the report and data from FFY 2008 for SCR, it was determined that the same data was collected at several points due to repetition of the sub-activities within the improvement activities. The activities were revised (below) to condense the sub-activities and analyze the data by strands within the Arizona Academic Standards. This will allow the SCR team to analyze the outcomes of specific training sessions.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Results (Completed) Or Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) By the end of Year 2, the Systemic Change in Reading (SCR) teams will increase proficiency rate to 50% for children with IEPs as determined by third grade AIMS data.	a) Provide reading training through the Systemic Change in Reading.		September 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011	CSPD Staff 95% Group
	b) Collect and analyze third grade AIMS reading data.		September 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011	CSPD Staff 95% Group
2) By the end of Year 2, the Systemic Change in Reading Teams will increase reading proficiency rate in phonemic awareness, and fluency (Strand 1) for students with IEPs as determined by third grade AIMS data.	a) Provide reading training in phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency through the Systemic Change in Reading team trainings.		September 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011	CSPD Staff 95% Group
	b) Collect and analyze third grade phonics and fluency strand data on the AIMS.		September 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011	CSPD Staff 95% Group
3) By the end of year 2 Systemic Change in Reading teams will increase proficiency rate in	a) Provide reading training comprehension and vocabulary strand through		September 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011	CSPD Staff 95% Group

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

comprehension and vocabulary (Strands 2 and 3) for students with IEPs as determined by third grade AIMS data.	Systemic Change in Reading.			
	b) Collect and analyze third grade Comprehension and Vocabulary data on the AIMS.		September 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011	CSPD Staff 95% Group

Public Reporting Information

The location (URL) of public reports of assessment results conforming with 34 CFR §300.160(f) is <http://www.ade.az.gov/ResearchPolicy/AIMSResults/>.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Not applicable.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Suspension / Expulsion

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))

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Significant discrepancy for suspension and expulsion is defined as a rate above 5% of the special education population with 10 or more special education students suspended.

Note: The total number of public education agencies (PEAs) in Arizona fluctuates from year to year due to the growth of charter schools throughout the State.

Data

Data Source

The 2007-2008 data were reported by the PEAs through the Annual Special Education Data Collection, an ADE Web-based system. The data are the same as reported in Table 5 under section 618.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology

The statewide discrepancy is computed by comparing suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities among PEAs in Arizona and comparing to a statewide average. A PEA is determined to be significantly discrepant when it suspended or expelled ten or more students with disabilities for more than 10 days and those suspended or expelled students were greater than 5% of its special education population.

Valid and Reliable Data

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data because it collected, maintained, and reported the November 1, 2008 discipline data through internal edit checks. The State requires an assurance from the PEAs through the submission of a signed form attesting to the validity of the data.

4.A — Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	1.4%

4.A — Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

Note: Data reported is from 2007-2008.

0.18%

Arizona exceeded the target.

4.A — LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancy	Percent
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	569	1	0.18%

4.B

Target data, baseline data, and improvement activities will be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices for FFY 2008

A review of the 2007–2008 suspension and expulsion data revealed one PEA having significant discrepancy. In accordance with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with requirements.

Arizona required the PEA with significant discrepancy 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. Also, the PEA was required to resubmit to ESS its policies and procedures related to the discipline requirements. A review determined the policies and procedures were in alignment with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.530 through §300.536.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The practices of the PEA were reviewed by means of a self assessment. The PEA conducted an assessment of its 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 desk audits during and after the self assessment to validate the accuracy of compliance calls. The specialists interviewed the special education administrator and reviewed student files to verify correction of student specific and systemic noncompliance and to ensure sustained compliance with regulatory requirements.

As a result of this review, the PEA was found to be in compliance with the regulatory requirements and the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

No progress or slippage occurred, as the percentage of PEAs that have significant discrepancy for suspension and expulsion is the same data as reported for FFY 2007, per OSEP guidance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed, Discontinued, and/or Revised, with Justification, for FFY 2008

Improvement activities #1 and #2 have been completed. Sub-activities #1 (a) and (b) and #2 (a) and (b) are discontinued; the balance of the sub-activities are revised. See the revised improvement activities below. Revisions to the improvement activities are necessary because the AHAA program no longer collects academic performance data; targeted Year 1 and Year 2 teams are specified; and an activity regarding Team Implementation Portfolio is added.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) By the end of two years of training with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports of Arizona (PBISAz), at least 70% of PBISAz teams will implement School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SW-PBIS) with fidelity as measured by a score of 80% on the Arizona Implementation Checklist	a) Year 2 - Between baseline data collection and the end of the second year of PBISAz training, PBISAz teams will decrease office discipline referrals by 10% for all students and 5% for students with IEPs as measured by the final PBISAz Quarterly Report data		8/1/09 – 6/30/10	PBISAz Coordinators AZ Implementation Checklist Quarterly Reports
	b) Year 2 - Between baseline data collection and the end of the second year of PBISAz training, PBISAz teams will decrease suspensions/expulsions by 15% for all students and 5% for students with IEPs as measured by		8/1/09 – 6/30/10	PBISAz Coordinators AZ Implementation Checklist ADE data

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	end-of-year data submitted to ADE			
	c) Year 2 - Between baseline data collection and the end of the second year of PBISAZ training, PBISAZ teams will decrease suspensions/expulsions over 10 days by 15% for all students and 5% for students with IEPs as measured by end-of-year data submitted to ADE		8/1/09 – 6/30/10	PBISAZ Coordinators AZ Implementation Checklist ADE data
2) Arizona High Achievement for All (AHAA) Year 1 schools will complete all tasks to establish the solid basis for the decrease of suspension/expulsion rates to less than 5%	a) Collection of baseline data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	b) Collection of baseline data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	c) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	d) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	e) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on impact of the AHAA project on suspensions/expulsions, office referrals, and academic performance	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
3) AHAA Year 2 schools will decrease the suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with	a) Collection of baseline data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

disabilities to less than 5%	b) Collection of baseline data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	c) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	d) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff
	e) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on impact of the AHAA project on suspensions/expulsions, office referrals, and academic performance	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Staff

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable. There were no findings of noncompliance.

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ESS uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes related to special education. The progressive enforcement actions taken by ESS for the PEAs that are unable to demonstrate compliance within one year from the date of written notification are as follows:

- 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.
- Assignment of a special monitor or, with ADE concurrence, permanent withholding of IDEA funds for a specific year. For charter schools not receiving federal 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.
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

The methods Arizona uses to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ESS specialists conduct follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits to verify correction of all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists again review the specific student files to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists review new files and conduct interviews with the special education administrators during subsequent visits and/or desk audits to determine if systemic changes occurred to ensure ongoing sustained compliance with regulatory requirements.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Not applicable.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following are revised improvement activities for #2 and #3. Revisions to the improvement activities are necessary because the AHAA program no longer collects academic performance data; targeted Year 1 and Year 2 teams are specified; and an activity regarding Team Implementation Portfolio is added.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
2) Arizona High Achievement for All (AHAA) Year 1 Siete schools will complete all tasks to establish the solid basis for the decrease of suspension/expulsion rates to less than 5%.	a) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities for Siete Year 1 teams by 6/30/10.		9/1/09 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff School Principals
	b) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities for Siete Year 1 teams by 6/30/10.		9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff School Principals
	c) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on the impact of the AHAA project on suspensions/expulsions and office referrals will be analyzed and reported on by 6/30/2011 for Siete Year 1 teams.		9/1/08 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff School Teams
	d) Team Implementation Portfolios will be completed by all Siete Year 1 school teams to demonstrate continuous team activities on site to implement training of staff with AHAA materials, differential reinforcement (check in/check out), and accommodation planning for diverse learners, including students with IEPs. Reporting will be 6/30/2011.		10/7/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff School Teams AHAA Director

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

<p>3) AHAA Year 2 Seis schools will decrease the suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with disabilities to less than 5 %.</p>	<p>a) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities for Seis Year 2 teams by 6/30/10.</p>		<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/10</p>	<p>CSPD Staff School Principals</p>
	<p>b) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities for Seis Year 2 teams by 6/30/10.</p>		<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/10</p>	<p>CSPD Staff School Principals</p>
	<p>c) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on the impact of the AHAA project on suspensions/expulsions and office referrals will be analyzed and reported on by 6/30/11.</p>		<p>9/1/08 – 6/30/11</p>	<p>CSPD Staff School Teams</p>
	<p>d) Team Implementation Portfolios will be completed by all school teams to demonstrate continuous team activities on site to implement training of staff with AHAA materials, differential reinforcement (check in/check out), and accommodation planning for diverse learners, including students with IEPs. Reporting will be 6/30/2011.</p>		<p>10/7/09 – 6/30/11</p>	<p>CSPD Staff School Teams AHAA Director</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: School Age LRE

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))

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

5.A, 5.B, and 5.C — Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target		
2008	A. > 80%	B. < 40%	C. Separate
	52%	15.5%	2.1%

5.A, 5.B, and 5.C — Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

	A. Served inside regular class 80% or more of the day	B. Served inside regular class less than 40% of the day	C. Served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements
# of children	62769	16548	3046
% of children	56.7%	14.9%	2.7%
# of students aged 6–21 with IEPs	110,765		

5.A—Arizona exceeded the target.

5.B—Arizona exceeded the target.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

5.C—Arizona did not meet the target.

Data

Data Source

The data was collected through the October 1, 2008 Child Count report and are the same as the State's data reported in the Educational Environments, Table 3, under section 618.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data because it collected, maintained, and reported the October 1, 2008 child count data and the February 1, 2009 placement data through internal edit checks. The State requires the PEAs to assure data accuracy and reliability through submission of a signed verification letter.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona exceeded the target on two of the three measures, 5.A and 5.B, and made progress as compared to FFY 2007. The target was not met on 5.C; rather, slippage occurred. Arizona continues to have a steady population of students in the most restrictive environments. 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 PEA's data does not meet State targets for LRE, then the concern is discussed with the administrators. If the PEA is in year 4 of the monitoring cycle, then a self assessment in this area may be one of the activities.

The ADE/ESS sponsors the AHAA Institute (Arizona High Achievement for All), which is designed for schools with data that does not meet State targets for Indicator 5. The Institute offers various sessions during a two-year time span to teams composed of building principals, special education teachers, general education teachers, and two other members of a school's choice. Each school receives a capacity building grant to support its participation in the Institute.

Training outcomes for AHAA during Year 1 are:

- Identify faculty beliefs about teaching and learning.
- Implement training to address teaching and learning belief system barriers.
- Create an Individualized Accommodation Plan to assist learners with special needs.
- Initiate behavioral data collection and determine areas of concern.
- Implement evidence-based practices on handling behavior problems without disrupting the flow of instruction, removing, or suspending.

Training outcomes during Year 2 are:

- Identify faculty belief system barriers to effectively handle problem behavior.
- Implement training to address behavior belief system barriers.
- Analyze the results of faculty handling behavior problems without disrupting the flow of instruction, removing, or suspending.
- Develop effective individualized behavior plans for treatment resistant individuals.
- Correlate interventions used with high profile students and the effects on behavior.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

- Analyze behavioral data collections.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed, Discontinued, and/or Revised, with Justification, for FFY 2008

The following improvement activities have been completed. Sub-activities #1 (a) and (b) and #2 (a) and (b) are discontinued; the balance of the sub-activities are revised. See the revised improvement activities below. Revisions to the improvement activities are necessary because the AHAA program no longer collects academic performance data; targeted Year 1 and Year 2 teams are specified; and an activity regarding Team Implementation Portfolio is added.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Arizona High Achievement for All (AHAA) Year 1 schools will complete all tasks to improve decision making for placing students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment	a) Collection of baseline data on suspension/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	b) Collection of baseline data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	c) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	d) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	e) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on impact of the AHAA project on suspension, expulsion, office referrals, academic performance, and placement in the least restrictive environment	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff
2) AHAA Year 2 schools will improve decision making for placing students with disabilities in the least restrictive	a) Collection of baseline data on suspension/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

environment	b) Collection of baseline data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity completed and discontinued (see revisions below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	c) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	d) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff
	e) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on impact of the AHAA project on suspension, expulsion, office referrals, academic performance, and placement in the least restrictive environment	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. This activity revised (see below).	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following are revised improvement activities for #2 and #3. Revisions to the improvement activities are necessary because the AHAA program no longer collects academic performance data; targeted Year 1 and Year 2 teams are specified; and an activity regarding Team Implementation Portfolio is added.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Arizona High Achievement for All (AHAA) Year 1 Siete schools will complete all tasks to improve decision making for placing students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.	a) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities for Siete Year 1 teams by 6/30/10.		9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff School Principals
	b) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities for Siete Year 1 teams.		9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff School Principals
	c) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with		9/1/08 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff School Teams

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	disabilities on the impact of the AHAA project on suspensions/expulsions, office referrals, and placement in the least restrictive environment will be analyzed and reported on by 6/30/11 for Siete Year 1 teams.			
	d) Team Implementation Portfolios will be completed by all Siete Year 1 school teams to demonstrate continuous team activities on site to implement training of staff with AHAA materials, differential reinforcement (check in/check out), and accommodation planning for diverse learners, including students with IEPs. Reporting will be 6/30/2011.		10/7/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff School Teams AHAA Director
2) Arizona High Achievement for All (AHAA) Year 2 Seis schools will complete all tasks to improve decision making for placing students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.	a) Collection of ending data on suspensions/expulsions for all students and students with disabilities for Seis Year 2 teams by 6/30/10.		9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff School Principals
	b) Collection of ending data on office referrals for all students and students with disabilities for Seis Year 2 teams by 6/30/10.		9/1/08 – 6/30/10	CSPD Staff School Principals
	c) Aggregation and disaggregation of data collected for all students and students with disabilities on the impact of the AHAA project on suspensions/expulsions, office referrals, and placing students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment will be analyzed and reported on by 6/30/11.		9/1/08 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff School Teams
	d) Team Implementation Portfolios will be completed by all school teams to demonstrate continuous team activities		10/7/09 – 6/30/11	CSPD Staff School Teams

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	<p>on site to implement training of staff with AHAA materials, differential reinforcement (check in/check out), and accommodation planning for diverse learners, including students with IEPs. Reporting will be 6/30/2011.</p>			<p>AHAA Director</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Preschool LRE

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))

Measurement

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

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

NOTE

- New baselines, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities will be established and submitted in the FFY 2009 APR.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	Not applicable

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

Not applicable.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Measurement

Outcomes

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

Progress categories for A, B, and C

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = $\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by } [\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress}$

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

category (d)] times 100.

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

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

Overview of Issue / Description of System or Process

In FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, the ADE Early Childhood Education (ECE) Division worked with ADE Information Technology (IT) and Research and Evaluation (R & E) to develop a Web-based data collection system that would operate through the ADE Student Accountability Information System (SAIS). Data collected for programs providing special education services for preschool children, as well as programs providing services for typically developing peers, is used to report on the outcomes specified in this indicator. Sampling is not used for this indicator as all preschool children with disabilities have their entry status and exit status assessed. All early childhood programs must select and administer one assessment tool from an Arizona State Board of Education approved menu of four ongoing progress monitoring assessments:

- 1) Child Observation Record (High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, MI)
- 2) Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum for Ages 3–5 (Teaching Strategies, Inc., Washington, DC)
- 3) Galileo Preschool Online Educational Management System (Assessment Technology, Incorporated, Tucson, AZ)
- 4) Work Sampling System (Pearson Learning Group, Parsippany, NJ)

Training on selected instruments and fidelity regarding assessment documentation was provided to Arizona programs by specific instrument publishing companies in summer and fall 2006. The ADE/ECE and IT staff provided training on data submission in SAIS to program administrators and SAIS coordinators in 11 half-day sessions throughout the state in summer and fall 2006. Twelve trainings in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 focused on the school districts' review and analysis of its assessment procedures and forms of evidence. Ongoing technical assistance for SAIS, including the early childhood assessment component, is provided by the IT Division.

Program submission of data and utilization of SAIS is governed by a set of SAIS documents addressing business rules, transactions, and design requirements. These documents may be reviewed at <http://www.ade.az.gov/sais/>. Specific information regarding the early childhood assessment transaction in SAIS may be reviewed in the *Student Accountability Information System Fiscal Year 2007 SAIS-Student Details Business Requirements Overview Version 7.6* on page 37 at <http://www.ade.az.gov/sais/FY07RequirementsOverview.doc>.

Data

Data Collection and Analysis

PEAs report the assessment data using a Web-based data collection system that is integrated with the ADE Student Accountability Information System (SAIS). Bi-annual data is collected from all programs providing special education services for preschool children as well as from all State-funded preschool programs providing services for typically developing peers.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Outcome data analysis was provided by Dr. Susan Wagner, president of Data Driven Enterprises, utilizing extrapolation of raw assessment data from SAIS. In years past, “comparable to same-aged peers” was defined as a score that is equal to or greater than the score obtained by 50% of the typical preschool children evaluated during the same time frame using the same instruments. However, ADE determined that this standard of performance is too stringent given that students who score below a 50th percentile score also are typically defined as “at age level.” In fact, the ECO Center recommends that “comparable to same-aged peers” be defined at the 10th percentile score for a given assessment (www.isbe.net/earlychi/pdf/ECO_recommendation.pdf).

Because ADE did not capture standard scores or percentile scores for these assessments, ADE considered a conceptual definition of “comparable to same-aged peers” that would be equated to a roughly 10th to 15th percentile score. In addition, slight statistical modifications in the scores were made in order to equate the results across the four assessments. Note that in FFY 2010, the ADE will be selecting one assessment that all preschools will use to measure student progress on these three outcome areas. Once this assessment is selected, “comparable to same-aged peers” will be tied to a standard score and a percentile score.

Valid and Reliable Data

In addition to offering professional development and incorporating a review of a PEA’s assessment system into monitoring visits, the Arizona Department of Education/Early Childhood Special Education (ADE/ECSE) assures the validity and reliability of the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data by conducting random checks of the database while reviewing PEAs’ submission status.

Baseline Data for FFY 2008

Table 7.1 displays the number and percentage of children in each progress category as well as the results of the summary statement calculations.

Table 7.1 Number and Percentage of Children in Each Progress Category and Summary Statement Calculations for FFY 2008

Progress Categories	Positive Social-Emotional Skills		Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	# of children	% of children	# of children	% of children	# of children	% of children
a. Children who did not improve functioning	90	2.70%	129	3.87%	105	3.15%
b. Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	530	15.90%	792	23.76%	496	14.88%
c. Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	737	22.11%	834	25.01%	816	24.48%
d. Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged	1214	36.41%	1166	34.97%	1190	35.69%

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

peers						
e. Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	763	22.89%	413	12.39%	727	21.81%
Total	3334	100.00%	3334	100.00%	3334	100.00%
Summary Statements						
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.		75.88%		68.47%		76.95%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.		59.30%		47.36%		57.50%
<i>Summary Statement 1 calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>						
<i>Summary Statement 2 calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>						

Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2008

Baseline data indicate that 47% to 59% of children are functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers when they exit the program and that 68% to 77% of children who entered the program below age expectations substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.

Data from FFY 2007 is not presented because it does not provide a legitimate comparison to the FFY 2008 data due to the different way that was used to define “comparable to same-aged peers.” ADE is confident that the FFY 2008 results are more representative than those in prior years due to the improved calculation method, the collection of three full years worth of data, and the accurate data pull of all children who exited the program in FFY 2008.

Targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010

Targets were set based on the FFY 2008 baseline data and input from the stakeholder group. The following targets have been set for 2009-10 and 2010-2011. These targets represent appropriate, yet challenging, targets.

Table 7.2 Targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010

Summary Statements	Positive Social-Emotional Skills	Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills	Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	75.88%	76.38%	68.47%	68.97%	76.95%	77.45%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	59.30%	59.80%	47.36%	47.86%	57.50%	57.90%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Develop and implement a plan to correct the reporting of data obtained from the <i>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum – Expanded Forerunners</i> to improve the validity of the data being reported	a) Identify systemic issues involved in making this change	Activities completed from 11/1/08 to 1/31/09. ECSE worked with IT and identified issues.	11/1/08 – 1/31/09	ADE/ECSE ADE Information Technology
	b) Work with the publisher to incorporate changes into on-line analysis	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 3/30/09. ECSE and IT worked with the publisher and made changes to the analysis.	1/1/09 – 3/30/09	ADE/ECSE
	c) Communicate changes to all PEAs utilizing this assessment system	Activities completed from 3/1/09 to 6/30/09. ECSE notified PEAs that used Creative Curriculum via e-mail.	3/1/09 – 6/30/09	ADE/ECSE
2) Develop and implement a multi-dimensional professional development plan to maximize the validity of the data being reported	a) Develop and administer professional development surveys to align compliance-based training needs with needs expressed by the field	Activities completed by 4/30/09. ECSE created and disseminated surveys in April 2009.	11/1/08 – 4/30/09	ADE/ECSE
	b) Map existing training and identify additional objectives for new professional development offerings	Activities completed by 2/28/09. ECSE identified new professional development in February 2009.	11/1/08 – 2/28/09	ADE/ECSE
	c) Identify existing ADE and community-based	Activities completed by 1/31/09.	11/1/08 – 1/31/09	ADE/ECSE

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	forums to present existing and new ECO-related training	ADE/ECSE identified existing forums where ECSE could provide professional development.		
	d) Adapt existing training to distance learning formats such as IDEAL, ADE's Internet-based professional development platform https://www.ideal.azed.gov	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. ADE/ECSE researched avenues for distance learning.	1/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ECSE ADE Educational Technology
	e) Develop new face-to-face and distance learning offerings		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE
3) Develop and implement a plan to redesign the Early Childhood Assessment and Reporting System to address methodological issues impacting reporting for this indicator	a) Gather internal ADE stakeholders to analyze the existing methodology and system	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. All internal ADE parties are reviewing current ECO systems.	1/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ECSE ADE/R&E ADE IT ADE Procurement
	b) Consult with external stakeholders to analyze the existing methodology and system	Activities completed from 2/1/09 to 6/30/09. ADE/ECSE consulted with stakeholders at the Directors Institute and Early Learning Institute.	2/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ECSE
	c) Identify key reporting and evaluation needs, desired assessment features, and professional development considerations	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. ADE/ECSE has begun the process to pinpoint the different features and other considerations for the assessment system.	1/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ECSE
	d) Initiate any necessary ADE infrastructure modifications and adapt professional development materials		7/1/09 – 12/31/10	ADE/ECSE ADE IT
	e) Develop the scope of work for a request for proposals (RFP) and solicitation process in anticipation of the end of the current assessment contracts in June 2011	Activities completed from 2/1/09 to 6/30/09. The scope of work was developed and the RFP process begins approximately 2/1/10.	2/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ECSE ADE Procurement

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement

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))

Measurement

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

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	47%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
8362	9468	88%
$8362 \div 9468 * 100 = 0.88 = 88\%$		

Arizona exceeded the target.

Data

Data Source

The data are taken from the Arizona Parent Survey. Arizona uses a 25-question parent survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM).

Data Description

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The Arizona Parent 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 large font, if needed. Parents complete the demographic data and 25 survey items. The data 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:

- a) in the assigned year of the ESS monitoring cycle; or
- b) with a student population of 50,000 or greater; or
- c) which had < 10% response rate in the prior survey year; or,
- d) which are newly opened (typically, charter schools).

Every parent within these PEAs is given an opportunity to complete the survey either via the Web-based data collection system or mail. ADE/ESS ensures all newly opened PEAs (typically, charter schools) are included in a cohort and administer the parent survey. Thus, within the cohort, a census of parents completes the survey. The use of these procedures will allow the State to meet the requirement to report on each PEA at least once during the SPP cycle.

Valid and Reliable Data

Arizona ensures the data is 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 IDs/Passwords to all parents who have a child with a disability. PEAs are given surplus User IDs/Passwords to have ready for transfer students. PEAs also receive guidance on how to maximize their parental response and involvement rates as demonstrated in the improvement activities.

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

Race/Ethnicity of Child of Parent Respondent	# of Responses	% of Responses	# of Special Education Population (Child Count)	% of Special Education Population (Child Count)
American Indian	1055	11.10%	9094	7.29%
Asian	162	1.70%	1928	1.54%
Black	483	5.10%	8436	6.76%
Hispanic	2913	30.80%	49179	39.41%
White	4280	45.20%	56156	45.00%
Multi-racial	506	5.30%		

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

No response	69	0.70%		
Total	9468		124793	

Table 8.1 shows the response rate by race/ethnicity is in alignment with the race/ethnicity of children in special education in Arizona for Asian and White populations. The response rate is higher for American Indians. The response rates are lower for Black and Hispanic parents; however, these rates are an improvement over last year. In FFY 2007, the response rate for Black parents was 4.20% (population was 6.57%); for Hispanic parents the rate was 25.36% (population was 39.16%). The rise in response rates for these three groups is likely due to efforts of the Parent Information Network (PIN) specialists to boost parent participation as part of Improvement Activity #1. The response rates from Black and Hispanic parents, which remain lower than State special education population data, will continue to be monitored during the next year and targeted through appropriate action steps.

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

Child Age Group	# of Responses	% of Responses	# of Special Education Population (Child Count)	% of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Ages 3–5	1183	12.50%	14028	11.24%
Ages 6–13	5510	58.20%	72441	58.05%
Ages 14–22	2621	27.70%	38324	30.71%
No response	154	1.60%		
Total	9468		124793	

Table 8.2 shows the response rates are in alignment with the age group statistics for parents of children ages 3–5 and 6–13. The response rate is slightly lower for parents of children ages 14–22, but is not unreasonably out of alignment with that age grouping of children in special education in Arizona.

For the second year in a row, a concerted effort by the PIN specialists to inform PEA administrators about survey procedures has resulted in a reasonable distribution of the survey to all families who have children receiving special education services, including those families of different racial and ethnic groups and with children of different age ranges. The administrators and PIN specialists co-sponsored parent events and offered technical assistance to give parents the opportunity to complete the survey.

Explanation of Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona exceeded the target for FFY 2008, but there was a slight decrease in the percentage of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services (i.e., from 90% in FFY 2007 to 88% in FFY 2008). This change may be attributed to two factors that differentiate the two survey years. In FFY 2008 there were a greater number of participating PEAs and a larger number of respondents as compared to FFY 2007. This was due to those PEAs repeating the survey as a result of a less than 10% response rate in the prior survey year and newly opened charters.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Although there was slippage, the PIN specialists were in contact with participating PEAs, as noted in the improvement activities. They offered free consultation, training, print and electronic special education resources, and toll-free assistance to families and schools throughout Arizona. Analysis of the requests for assistance during FFY 2008 shows an increase in the use of PIN services by educators and families. PIN services, founded on principles of effective parent involvement reflected in the NCSEAM survey questions, align with the strategies, which if used by the PEAs, would yield a higher measurement of satisfactory parental involvement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Completed	Projected	
1) Increase number of survey responses from parents of all races/ethnicities and age groups to ensure survey responses are representative of the State special education population	a) Advise PEAs of effective communication strategies with families about the importance of survey feedback via bi-monthly phone, e-mail, and/or on-site consultation with participating PEAs	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. PIN specialists and ESS program specialists provided approximately 1,600 combined phone, e-mail, and on-site contacts with PEAs.	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists ADE/ESS Program Specialists
	b) Explain and/or demonstrate the survey process to parents and educators through survey workshops or parent events designed to encourage survey responses, and post monthly response rate tallies for PEAs to self-monitor their progress	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. 127 workshops and events (approximately 1,500 attendees) were held to explain or demonstrate the survey to parents and educators. 10 monthly response rate tallies were posted to PEAs.	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists Arizona Parent Survey data collection system ADE/ESS Parent Survey public awareness Web site (www.azed.gov/ess/parent_survey)
	c) Develop and distribute public awareness announcements promoting the parent survey to agencies and organizations who serve families	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. A parent survey announcement was emailed to 55 Enhancing Arizona's Parent Networks (EAPN) groups. A survey	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists (www.azed.gov/ess/pin Specialists) Enhancing Arizona's

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		announcement was printed in two editions of the PIN newsletter which was mailed to 5,488 parents and agencies; posted on PIN website at http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/specialprojects/pins/pals/ ; and, emailed to all AZ PEAs, EAPN members, and several hundred families.		Parent Networks (www.azeapn.org)
	d) Review existing technical assistance documents and/or participate in Indicator 8 technical assistance activities to augment the Arizona Parent Survey process as a means to improve statewide response and parent involvement rates	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. Annual review and revision of documents was completed by PIN coordinator and ESS-IT specialist.	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator MPRRC Web site and teleconferences Technical Assistance Alliance of Parent Centers (www.taalliance.org)
2) Increase awareness of training, consultation, and resources available statewide to facilitate parent involvement in the special education process	a) Develop and maintain curricula to increase parent knowledge of the special education process and effective parent involvement strategies	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. Annual review and revision of curricula and supporting documents was completed by PIN coordinator and PIN specialists.	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists Technical Assistance Alliance of Parent Centers (www.taalliance.org) National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (www.nichcy.org)
	b) Utilize the PIN Clearinghouse—a repository of printed and Web-based special education resources and training tools—to inform families about the special	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. PIN Clearinghouse resources were distributed throughout the year at trainings,	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists ADE/ESS

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	education process and opportunities for their involvement	exhibits, and consultations. Resources were posted on the PIN website (http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/specialprojects/pinspals/).		PIN Clearinghouse (www.ade.az.gov/ess/specialprojects/pinspals/documents/)
	c) Collaborate with the Arizona PTI, and other agencies and parent organizations, to widely disseminate information about each group's training and events designed to instruct and support families who have children with disabilities	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. Bi-monthly announcements were emailed to the AZ PTI and other EAPN members promoting parent activities and soliciting events for the EAPN training calendar (https://www.ade.az.gov/ESS/EAPN/). 248 events and trainings were posted on the EAPN training calendar.	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists Raising Special Kids Enhancing Arizona's Parent Networks (www.azeapn.org)
3) Review and enhance PEAs' initiatives designed to facilitate parent involvement	a) Consult with PEAs to address family involvement strengths and needs by using previous Parent Survey data, if available, or other measures the district utilizes to judge parent participation	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. PIN specialists conducted 578 consultations. ESS program specialists conducted approximately 307 consultations.	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists ADE/ESS Program Specialists Arizona Parent Survey database system
	b) Develop and implement staff and/or parental consultation, training, and/or distribution of resources to improve PEA parent involvement initiatives	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. Annual review and revision of curricula and supporting documents was completed by PIN coordinator and PIN specialists. PIN specialists consulted and trained 8,040 individuals.	9/1/08-6/30/11	ADE/ESS PIN Coordinator ADE/ESS PIN Specialists

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		PIN Clearinghouse documents were downloaded from the PIN website (http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/specialprojects/pins/pals/documents/).		
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Racial / Ethnic Disproportionality

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))

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of Disproportionate Representation

Disproportionate Representation	Weighted Risk Ratio	Target Racial/Ethnic Group	Racial/Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services
Under representation	≤ 0.30 and above	30	30
Over representation	≥ 3.00 and below	30	30

Methodology

The data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to produce a weighted risk ratio (WRR) that identifies all racial/ethnic groups for all PEAs in the State. The ADE/ESS also used SAS to calculate an alternate risk ratio (ARR) for PEAs that may have low numbers of students in either a particular ethnic group or other ethnicities, or both. The formula determined an ARR for PEAs if the PEA had more than 10 students in an ethnic group of interest, but less than 10 students in the comparable group. The ARR gives meaningful information about the multitude of small-sized rural school districts and public charter schools in Arizona, whereas risk ratios are more difficult to interpret based on small numbers of students.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

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

Arizona revised and refined its State procedures in FFY 2008 to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices are reviewed annually for all PEAs in a consistent manner and meet the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.600(d)(3), and 300.602(a).

The data are analyzed annually and PEAs are flagged each year for both under representation and 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 PEA's 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 re-submit 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 re-submit the policies and procedures to the Exceptional Student Services for review and acceptance."

Arizona's Review of PEA's 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 under representation or over representation the first year:

- If the PEA has current monitoring data from an open Corrective Action Plan or has an on-site monitoring scheduled during the current year, then child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices are investigated through the State's monitoring process. Verification of student specific and systemic correction is done through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
- If the PEA does not have current monitoring data or is not scheduled for an on-site monitoring during the current year, then 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. Verification of student specific and systemic correction is done through on-site visits and/or desk audits.

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

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the ESS program specialist:
 - Validates the prior year's self assessment by reviewing a sample of individual student files; and,
 - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

- 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 utilized to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and,
 - Review individual student files using the State’s monitoring forms.
 - Verification of student specific and systemic correction is done by the ESS specialist through on-site visits and/or desk audits.

When noncompliance is found, the PEA has one year from the date of written notification from the State to correct the noncompliance.

Data

Data Source

The ADE/ESS collected the data from the PEAs through the October 1, 2008, Child Count report. The data is the same as collected and reported on Table 1 (Child Count) of the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended, for all children with disabilities aged 6–21 served under IDEA.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data because it collected, maintained, and reported the October 1, 2008 child count data through internal edit checks. In addition, the State requires the PEAs to assure data accuracy and reliability with a signed verification letter.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	0%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

0%

Arizona met the target.

Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Year	Total Number of PEAs	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	577	0	0	0.00%

Explanation of Progress for FFY 2008

The 0% results this year are the same as compared to last year (FFY 2007). The ADE/ESS staff has attended OSEP-sponsored conferences to become better informed about the issues that may cause disproportionate representation to exist as a result of inappropriate identification in Arizona. Information and resources are disseminated to local school administrators. Supporting the continuing achievement of the 0% target for this indicator are an increasing awareness of disproportionality, continuing knowledge acquisition, and the availability of useful resources.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Develop and implement a system for PEAs that are flagged as at risk for disproportionate representation (DR)	a) Analyze data on an annual basis to flag PEAs that have: (i) WRR equal to 2.5 and above for over representation (ii) WRR equal to 0.40 and below for under representation	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Data were analyzed to obtain a WRR that flags PEAs as at-risk for over representation (≥ 2.5) and under representation (≤ 0.40)	7/1/09 – 8/1/11	ADE/ESS Directors and Program Specialists ADE Research and Evaluation MPRRC
	b) Notify PEAs on an annual basis that are flagged as at risk for disproportionate representation		8/1/09 – 9/1/11	ADE/ESS Directors
	c) Provide assessment tools and guidelines on an annual basis to PEAs that are flagged as at risk to conduct a root cause analysis		9/1/09 – 12/1/11	ADE/ESS Directors
	d) Provide resources to PEAs on an annual basis that are flagged as at risk for disproportionate representation		10/1/09 – 12/31/11	ADE/ESS Directors

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if State did not report 0%)

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 0%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	0
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	0
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance)

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ESS uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes related to special education. The progressive enforcement actions taken by ESS for the PEAs that are unable to demonstrate compliance within one year from the date of written notification are as follows:

- 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.
- Assignment of a special monitor or, with ADE concurrence, permanent withholding of IDEA funds for a specific year. For charter schools not receiving federal 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.
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The methods Arizona uses to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ESS specialists review policies and procedures if PEAs made changes after the policies and procedures were last reviewed and accepted by the ADE/ESS.
- ESS specialists review individual student files through on-site visits and/or desk audits and interview special education administrators to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance and are complying with child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements.
- ESS specialists review new files during subsequent visits and/or desk audits to ensure the PEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility and to ensure sustained compliance.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	0
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	0
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has not verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Racial / Ethnic Disproportionality by Disability

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))

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of Disproportionate Representation

Disproportionate Representation	Weighted Risk Ratio	Target Racial/Ethnic Group	Racial/Ethnic Groups in Special Education and Related Services
Under representation	≤ 0.30 and above	30	30
Over representation	≥ 3.00 and below	30	30

Methodology

The data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to produce a weighted risk ratio (WRR) that identifies all racial/ethnic groups for all PEAs in the State. The ADE/ESS also used SAS to calculate an alternate risk ratio (ARR) for PEAs that may have low numbers of students in either a particular ethnic group or other ethnicities, or both. The formula determined an ARR for PEAs if the PEA had more than 10 students in an ethnic group of interest, but less than 10 students in the comparable group. The ARR gives meaningful information about the multitude of small-sized rural school districts and public charter schools in Arizona, whereas risk ratios are more difficult to interpret based on small numbers of students.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

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

Arizona revised and refined its State procedures in FFY 2008 to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices are reviewed annually for all PEAs in a consistent manner and meet the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.600(d)(3), and 300.602(a).

The data are analyzed annually and PEAs are flagged each year for both under representation and 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 PEA's 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 re-submit 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 re-submit the policies and procedures to the Exceptional Student Services for review and acceptance."

Arizona's Review of PEA's 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 under representation or over representation the first year:

- If the PEA has current monitoring data from an open Corrective Action Plan or has an on-site monitoring scheduled during the current year, then child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices are investigated through the State's monitoring process. Verification of student specific and systemic correction is done through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
- If the PEA does not have current monitoring data or is not scheduled for an on-site monitoring during the current year, then 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. Verification of student specific and systemic correction is done through on-site visits and/or desk audits.

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

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the ESS program specialist:
 - Validates the prior year's self assessment by reviewing a sample of individual student files; and,
 - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

- 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 utilized to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and,
 - Review individual student files using the State’s monitoring forms.
 - Verification of student specific and systemic correction is done by the ESS specialist through on-site visits and/or desk audits.

When noncompliance is found, the PEA has one year from the date of written notification from the State to correct the noncompliance.

Data

Data Source

The ADE/ESS collected the data from the PEAs through the October 1, 2008, Child Count report. The data is the same as collected and reported on Table 1 (Child Count) of the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended, for all children with disabilities aged 6–21 served under IDEA.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data because it collected, maintained, and reported the October 1, 2008 child count data through internal edit checks. In addition, the State requires the PEAs to assure data accuracy and reliability with a signed verification letter.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	0%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

0%

Arizona met the target.

Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Year	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	577	7	0	0.00%

Table 10.1 PEAs, and Cases, with Under Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group and Disability

Note: The cases give a duplicated count.

Cases of under representation	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
Autism					
Emotionally Disturbed				3	
Mental Retardation					
Other Health Impairments				3	
Specific Learning Disability					
Speech and Language Impairment					
# of PEAs flagged for under representation					4
# of PEAs found to have disproportionate representation (under representation) as a result of inappropriate identification					0

The following is a breakdown of Table 10.1:

- Four PEAs were flagged for under representation due to a WRR of 0.30 or below for a total of six cases (i.e., 3 + 3 = 6).
- Two PEAs were flagged for one racial/ethnic group (Hispanic) for two different disability categories (ED and OHI). This accounted for four of the six cases.
- One PEA was flagged for one racial/ethnic (Hispanic) for one disability category (ED).

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

- One PEA was flagged for one racial/ethnic (Hispanic) for one disability category (OHI).
- One PEA was found to have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

The four PEAs flagged for under representation submitted compliant special education policies and procedures that were 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.

The practices of the four PEAs were investigated through the ESS monitoring system and/or an ESS self assessment with verification by an on-site visit or desk audit. The practices of all four PEAs were found to be consistent with 34 CFR §300.173 and §300.600(d)(3) and in compliance.

The following describes the investigation of the practices of the four PEAs:

- Two PEAs were flagged for two consecutive years and it was determined that both did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year. In order to confirm this conclusion, the ESS specialist reviewed individual student files from the current school year (2009-2010) through subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits. It was determined that the PEAs were in compliance with regulatory requirements and that the PEAs did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.
- One PEA was flagged for two consecutive years and it was determined to have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year. (This PEA had an open Corrective Action Plan.) In order to confirm this conclusion, student files were reviewed by the ESS specialist during subsequent on-site visits to verify correction of child specific and systemic noncompliance. New student files were reviewed to ensure sustained compliance with regulatory requirements. All noncompliance was corrected and verified and it was determined that this PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.
- One PEA was flagged for two consecutive years and it was determined to have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year. This PEA had recently corrected all student specific cases of noncompliance in the Corrective Action Plan and was in compliance with regulatory requirements. The PEA conducted a self assessment. The ESS specialist reviewed individual student files during a subsequent on-site visit to validate the accuracy of compliance calls, to verify all student specific and systemic noncompliance was corrected, and to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements. It was determined that this PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

Table 10.2 PEAs, and Cases, with Over Representation by Racial/Ethnic Group and Disability

Note: The cases give a duplicated count.

Cases of over representation	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
Autism					1
Emotionally Disturbed					4
Mental					

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Retardation					
Other Health Impairments					2
Specific Learning Disability					
Speech and Language Impairment					
# of PEAs flagged for over representation			6		
# of PEAs found to have disproportionate representation (over representation) as a result of inappropriate identification			0		

The following is a breakdown of Table 10.2:

- Six PEAs were flagged for over representation due to a WRR of 3.0 or above for a total of seven cases (i.e., 1 + 4 + 2 = 7).
- One PEA was flagged for one racial/ethnic group (White) for two different disability categories (ED and OHI). This accounted for two of the seven cases.
- Three PEAs were flagged for one racial/ethnic group (White) for one disability category (ED). This accounted for three of the seven cases.
- One PEA was flagged for one racial/ethnic group (White) for one disability category (OHI).
- One PEA was flagged for one racial/ethnic group (White) for one disability category (Autism).
- No PEAs were found to have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

The six PEAs flagged for over representation submitted special education policies and procedures that were 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.

The practices of the six PEAs were investigated through the ESS monitoring system or an ESS self assessment with verification by an on-site visit or desk audit. The practices of all six PEAs were found to be consistent with 34 CFR §300.173 and §300.600(d)(3) and in compliance.

The following describes the investigation of the practices of the six PEAs:

- One PEA was flagged for the first time during FFY 2008. This PEA conducted a self assessment with a review of student files. Validation of the compliance calls was completed by the ESS specialist through desk audits. It was determined that this PEA was in compliance with regulatory requirements and that the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.
- Four PEAs were flagged for two consecutive years and it was determined that the four did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year. In order to confirm this conclusion, the ESS specialist reviewed individual student files from the current school year (2009-2010) through subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits. It was

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

determined that these PEAs were in compliance with regulatory requirements and that the PEAs did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

- One PEA was flagged for two consecutive years and it was determined to have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year. (This PEA had an open Corrective Action Plan.) In order to confirm this conclusion, student files were reviewed by the ESS specialist during subsequent on-site visits to verify correction of child specific and systemic noncompliance. New student files were reviewed to ensure sustained compliance with regulatory requirements. All noncompliance was corrected and verified and it was determined that this PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

Summary of Table 10.1 and Table 10.2

- Three PEAs were flagged for both under representation and over representation, with a duplicated count of 10 PEAs flagged.
- An unduplicated count gives a total of seven PEAs flagged for both under representation and over representation. The seven PEAs involve a total of 13 cases.

Explanation of Progress that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona made progress due to an ever-increasing focus on analysis of PEAs' data. Every February the ESS specialists meet in small groups with the ESS directors to analyze the results related to each APR indicator for their assigned PEAs. That examination of data helps the specialists and directors make decisions about which PEAs are at risk for disproportionate representation. The ESS specialists then conduct on-site visits with special education administrators throughout the State to discuss the disproportionality data and review child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices. The local administrators also have the option to call other specialists in the State department who work directly with the disproportionality data and indicators for further analysis and discussion.

The annual ESS Directors Institute again offered participants both small group sessions and individual consultations with an external data consultant and the ESS data management specialist. Each PEA received an individualized data profile which described two- or three-year trend data and State results. This gave school personnel the opportunity to ask questions about the weighted risk ratio and to problem solve using their own data profile. Other presentations at the Directors Institute also emphasized accurate data collection and reporting, efficient usage of the State's data systems, and interpretation of results to better understand disproportionality.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Develop and implement a system for PEAs that are flagged as at risk for disproportionate representation	a) Analyze data on an annual basis to flag PEAs that have: (i) WRR equal to 2.5 and above for over representation (ii) WRR equal to 0.40 and below for under representation	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Data were analyzed to obtain a WRR that flags PEAs as at-risk for over representation (≥ 2.5) and under representation (≤ 0.40)	7/1/09 – 8/1/11	ADE/ESS Directors and Program Specialists ADE Research and Evaluation MPRC

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	b) Notify PEAs on an annual basis that are flagged as at risk for disproportionate representation		8/1/09 – 9/1/11	ADE/ESS Directors
	c) Provide assessment tools and guidelines on an annual basis to PEAs that are flagged as at risk to conduct a root cause analysis		9/1/09 – 12/1/11	ADE/ESS Directors
	d) Provide resources to PEAs on an annual basis that are flagged as at risk for disproportionate representation		10/1/09 – 12/31/11	ADE/ESS Directors

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported more than 0% compliance)

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 0.35%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	2
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	2
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)	0
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance (two PEAs) were corrected within the one-year timeline. These two PEAs developed a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in collaboration with the ADE/ESS specialists. The ESS specialists verified correction of student specific and systemic noncompliance during on-site visits at both school districts. The school personnel at both school districts changed the necessary policies,

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

procedures, and practices to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements pertaining to child find, evaluation, and eligibility.

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ESS uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes related to special education. The progressive enforcement actions taken by ESS for the PEAs that are unable to demonstrate compliance within one year from the date of written notification are as follows:

- 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.
- Assignment of a special monitor or, with ADE concurrence, permanent withholding of IDEA funds for a specific year. For charter schools not receiving federal 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.
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ESS specialists reviewed policies and procedures if PEAs made changes after the policies and procedures were last reviewed and accepted by the ADE/ESS.
- ESS specialists reviewed individual student files through on-site visits and/or desk audits and interviewed special education administrators to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance and were complying with child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements.
- ESS specialists reviewed new files during subsequent visits and/or desk audits to ensure the PEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility and to ensure sustained compliance.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	1
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	1
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has not verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The remaining FFY 2006 finding of noncompliance (one PEA) was corrected. This PEA received numerous on-site visits and desk audits from the ADE/ESS specialist to verify correction of child specific and systemic noncompliance. The specialist reviewed new student files during subsequent visits to verify sustained compliance. A special monitor, selected by the PEA from a list provided by the ADE, worked with the special education administrator to ensure systemic change resulted in compliance with the regulatory requirements.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Evaluation Timelines

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))

Measurement

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

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

92%

Arizona did not meet the target.

Method Used to Collect Data

Data Source

Data is from the Arizona monitoring system and is based on actual number of days, not an average number of days. Arizona has established a 60-day timeline for initial evaluations. Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) R7-2-401 (E) (3) says the initial evaluation shall not exceed 60 calendar days from receipt of informed written consent. The 60-day evaluation period may be extended for an additional 30 days if in the best interests of the child and the parents and the public education agency agree in writing to do so (AAC R7-2-401 (E) (4)).

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2008

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Arizona is implementing its revised monitoring process and system during FFY 2009, in consultation with Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC). One result is the redefinition of a finding, which should help streamline tracking, verification, and reporting of correction.

During FFY 2008, a finding by incidence is defined as every individual source of information, and having a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. A source of information may include a student file, survey, interview, or other documentation. The finding by incidence is a written notification to the PEA by the State that the individual source of information is noncompliant.

Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or State-established timeline)

a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	713
b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timelines)	654
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established-timeline) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	92%

Children Included in a (above) and Not Included in b (above)

FFY 2008 Noncompliance

# findings by incidence of noncompliance	# of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/15/10
59	59

Range of Days beyond the Timeline and Reasons for the Delays

Table 11.1 Range of Days beyond Timeline

Range of days	1 - 303
Mean	46
Median	21
Mode	2

The 303 days beyond the 60-day timeline occurred at a small charter school. The speech/language pathologist took medical leave; the charter school director did not follow through on the evaluation process in a timely manner with the substitute speech/language pathologist. However, the evaluation was completed. The ADE/ESS verified the correction of the child specific noncompliance and verified that a new strategy was developed to ensure compliance with the 60-day evaluation timelines. Follow-up visits

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

by the ESS specialist verified that new evaluations are being done within the timeline to ensure sustained compliance.

Table 11.2 Reasons Given for Delays

Note: More than one reason for the delay beyond the timeline was given in some instances.

Delays in parent response or availability	24
Shortage of evaluation staff	11
Lack of an adequate timeline tracking system	7
Miscalculation of timeline date	5
Unavailability of required personnel (parent, general education teacher, etc.)	5
Unavailability of the student (e.g., absence)	3
Interruptions in the school calendar	3
Need for specialized evaluation (medical, audiological, etc.)	2
Lack of evaluation materials	1
Lack of vision and/or hearing screenings	1
Prior Written Notice refusing further assessment not documented	1
Delay with student acquiring eyeglasses needed for evaluation	1

Explanation of Progress that Occurred for FFY 2008

The results show an increase of three percentage points, from 89% in FFY 2007 to 92% for the current reporting year. Progress can be attributed to the annual technical assistance site visits and follow-up by the ADE/ESS specialists that continue to focus on this Indicator. The first site visit of the school year must be completed by the end of the second quarter of the school year and information entered into the log by the specialist within seven calendar days. This visit consists of informing the staff about the requirements of IDEA regarding evaluation timelines. School staff is asked to analyze their system for tracking timelines and examine files. When the PEA does not have systems in place, a second site visit is conducted by the beginning of the fourth quarter of the school year. The PEAs which continue to have difficulty with following evaluation timelines receive more technical assistance from the assigned specialist. Further analysis of the reasons is done and systemic changes are suggested by the ESS specialists to improve adherence to the timeline.

The ongoing review and revision of the State's monitoring system is intensifying the emphasis on a comprehensive data review. The broad examination of data allows the ESS specialists to pinpoint the PEAs lacking 100% compliance with evaluation timelines and provide appropriate support so that noncompliance is corrected and requirements are met.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Revise ADE/ESS monitoring process and system	a) ADE/ESS Monitoring Team will revise monitoring process and system	Activities completed as of 7/24/09. Revision of monitoring system completed. Monitoring system increased focus on compliance and results indicator data, PEA determinations, dispute resolution findings, and technical assistance outcomes. ESS specialists review data for every PEA in order to make decisions about the type of monitoring (data review, self assessment, or on site) in which the PEA will participate in year 4 of the 6-year cycle. PEAs in any year of the 6-year cycle may be moved to year 4 of the cycle if data warrant.	5/1/08 – 12/31/09	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team MPRRC DAC
	b) Field test revised monitoring system	Activities completed during school year 2009-2010. Minor revisions and adjustments will be made throughout the year, based on feedback from ESS specialists and the field.	1/1/10 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team
	c) Revise monitoring system based on results from field test		7/1/10 – 9/30/10	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team MPRRC DAC
	d) Implementation of fully revised system and process		10/1/10	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team
	e) Collect and analyze data from revised monitoring system		10/1/10 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

2) Develop and disseminate a tool for PEAs to track 60-day evaluation timelines	a) Develop evaluation tracking system	Activities completed as of 8/08. ADE/ESS developed an easy-to-use form to track evaluation timelines and other timelines in special education.		MPRRC ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Specialists SEAP
	b) Disseminate evaluation tracking system	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. ADE/ESS specialists distributed the tracking form to the PEAs during site visits or via e-mail. The Sped Timeline Tracking Form also was available on the ADE/ESS web site at http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/ under Resources>Forms.	9/1/08 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Specialists
	c) Provide technical assistance to PEAs using evaluation tracking system	Activities completed from 9/1/08 to 6/30/09. ADE/ESS specialists provided information and training with regard to evaluation timelines during file reviews with staff and as formal presentations.	9/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Specialists

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance)

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 89%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	84
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	65
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	19

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	19
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	19
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The 84 findings of noncompliance related to the 60-day evaluation timeline have been corrected. The correction of each child specific case of noncompliance was verified by ESS program specialists. In order to ensure that compliance with regulatory requirements was sustained, ESS specialists made subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits during the open Corrective Action Plan to review new student files and interview PEA staff members.

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ESS uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes related to special education. The progressive enforcement actions taken by ESS for the PEAs that are unable to demonstrate compliance within one year from the date of written notification are as follows:

- 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.
- Assignment of a special monitor or, with ADE concurrence, permanent withholding of IDEA funds for a specific year. For charter schools not receiving federal 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.
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

FFY 2007 Verification of Correction from Monitoring

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted a minimum of three follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify correction of all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists again reviewed the child specific files from the recent monitoring to determine if the correction occurred within 60 calendar days from the date of written notification of noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed new files and conducted interviews with the special education administrators during subsequent visits and/or desk audits to determine if systemic changes

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

occurred to ensure ongoing sustained compliance with regulatory requirements regarding initial evaluations.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following are new improvement activities to ensure compliance with Indicator 11.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Decrease the number of unfilled positions for speech/language pathologists in Arizona	a) Collect and analyze data on unfilled positions in PEAs through the Annual Special Education Data Collection		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD ADE/ESS Data Management Specialist
	b) Recruit at national ASHA conference		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
	c) Recruit at national CEC conference		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
	d) Conduct annual Arizona Teach-In, a statewide recruitment fair for Arizona education employers		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
	e) Sponsor the Arizona Education Employment Board, a free statewide employment board for employers and prospective employees		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
	f) Provide tuition assistance in the master's program to school-based speech-		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	language technicians via the SPDG grant and a contract with Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University			
2) Decrease the number of unfilled positions for school psychologists in Arizona	a) Collect and analyze data on unfilled positions in PEAs through the Annual Special Education Data Collection		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD ADE/ESS Data Management Specialist
	b) Recruit at national CEC conference		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
	c) Conduct annual Arizona Teach-In, a statewide recruitment fair for Arizona education employers		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
	d) Sponsor the Arizona Education Employment Board, a free statewide employment board for employers and prospective employees		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS CSPD
3) Revise ADE/ESS AZTAS evaluation and eligibility document used for technical assistance (AZTAS is the Arizona Technical Assistance System)	a) ADE/ESS will rewrite the AZTAS Evaluation and Eligibility document	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. Evaluation document revised to reflect new requirements and procedures. Expanded with new guidance, sample forms, and definitions.	1/1/09 – 6/30/09	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintende nt and Directors
	b) Disseminate the AZTAS Evaluation and Eligibility document to the PEAs electronically and via ESS specialist		7/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintende nt, Directors, and Specialists

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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))

Measurement

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

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.

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

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

93%

Arizona did not meet the target.

Method Used to Collect Data

Data Source

The data are reported annually by all PEAs that have children who transition from Part C to Part B. The data are collected through the Annual Special Education Data Collection, an ADE Web-based data collection system.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS assures the validity and reliability of the data as it is collected, maintained, and reported through internal edit checks. The State requires an assurance from the PEAs through the submission of a signed form attesting to the validity of the data. 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.

Actual State Data (Numbers)

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2807
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday	379
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	2095
d. # for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	174
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. NOTE: State's data not available for FFY 2008 APR. <i>[This information is not required until the 2011 submission but may be reported in 2010 if the State's data are available.]</i>	0
# in a but not in b, c, d, or e.	159
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 Percent = $[(c) / (a-b-d-e)] * 100$	93%

The actual State data (above) reflects eight findings of noncompliance for FFY 2008. A finding is defined as the number of PEAs with noncompliance. Correction of the noncompliance will be reported in the FFY 2009 APR. However, all eight PEAs corrected the noncompliance as of 12/31/09.

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

Late referrals from Part C	123
Failed hearing or vision screening	27

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Shortage of evaluation staff	7
Interruption of school year	2
Total	159

Range of Days beyond Third Birthday

Range of days	1 - 150
---------------	---------

The 150 days beyond the third birthday occurred at an elementary school district. The reason for the delay was due to a shortage of bilingual speech/language pathologists. When the district was unable to hire an employee, it contracted with a bilingual evaluator. Upon completion of the evaluation process, the IEP was developed and services were implemented. The ECSE specialist verified the correction of the child specific and systemic noncompliance through a desk audit.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Conduct joint ADE/AzEIP "Transition 101" trainings annually for new Arizona Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers (AzEIP) and PEA staff	a) Conduct "Transition 101" trainings annually at the Directors' Institute for new AzEIP and PEA staff	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. One training was held at the Directors Institute in September 2008.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff AzEIP Staff PEA Staff
	b) Review and revise resource materials, and disseminate to new AzEIP and PEA staff	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Four documents were produced by ADE/ECSE and AzEIP and were disseminated at trainings and meetings.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff AzEIP Staff
	c) Post resource materials on the ADE/ECSE Web site	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Four new documents were posted on the ADE/ECSE web site.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff AzEIP Staff
2) Implement Alert System between Part C and Part B to examine and resolve systemic issues	a) Maintain database to track the number of alerts reported to both ECSE and AzEIP	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Database has been maintained by ADE/ECSE and AzEIP to track the alerts.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	b) Maintain database to track the number of days for issues to be resolved between AzEIP and PEAs and intervene in a timely manner	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Database has been maintained by ADE/ECSE and AzEIP to track the days and resolve issues within a reasonable time.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff
	c) Maintain database to track the reasons an alert was issued and intervene to resolve systemic issues	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Database has been maintained by ADE/ECSE and AzEIP to track the reasons for alerts and intervene when necessary.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff
3) Conduct targeted technical assistance to PEAs found to be noncompliant	a) Provide phone and e-mail consultation to PEAs found to be noncompliant	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. ADE/ECSE staff provided consultations via phone, e-mail, and site visits to provide technical assistance.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff
	b) Review noncompliant PEAs' policies, procedures, and practices via desk audits and monthly review of data	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. ADE/ECSE staff reviewed policies, procedures, and practices through desk audits.	7/1/08 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE Staff

Explanation of Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona experienced slippage of five percentage points from 98% in FFY 2007 to 93% in FFY 2008. The State's data collection system highlighted the difficulties encountered during FFY 2008 with late Part C referrals to Part B, which contributed to the slippage. A portion of the late referrals from Part C were actually late referrals to Part C; however, they were not captured by the State's data collection system. The information gained from the data analysis emphasizes the need to modify the data collection system in cooperation with Part C to ensure timely transitions for young children.

Although slippage occurred, the ADE and the Arizona Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers (AzEIP) continued to collaborate during the year to provide trainings between service coordinators and school personnel that emphasized the building of relationships and developing joint written process, procedures, and agendas for transition meetings. These co-trainings were offered at the ESS Directors Institute, the Early Learning Institute, by request, or in areas where issues were identified through the Alert system. Guidance documents were developed or revised and posted on the ECSE website at <http://www.ade.az.gov/earlychildhood/preschool/programs/presch/>. The ECE division continued to track AzEIP Alerts and assisted districts and service coordinators resolve system issues. Targeted technical assistance was provided to districts that were not in compliance via individual trainings, monthly audits, and consultations. ESS specialists reviewed files during their annual site visits to provide technical assistance when needed.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance)

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 98%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	12
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	12
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The 12 PEAs submitted to ECSE the policies and procedures for early intervention transitions that were mutually agreed upon with the AzeIP service coordinators. All PEAs demonstrated three consecutive months of compliance with early childhood transitions. Verification of correction of the child specific and systemic noncompliance was done by ECSE and ESS specialists through on-site visits and/or desk audits for all the PEAs.

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ECSE interrupts 619 funds until full compliance is demonstrated.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ECE specialists reviewed the written process and procedures for the PEAs' early intervention transitions.
- ADE/ESS specialists and/or ADE/ECE specialists reviewed student files during subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance and are adhering to the regulatory requirements.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	2
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	2
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

These two PEAs submitted data through the Annual Special Education Data Collection documenting 100% compliance with early childhood transitions. Verification of correction of child specific and systemic noncompliance was done by ECSE specialists.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following is a new improvement activity based on guidance from the OSEP Early Childhood Transition FAQs dated 12/1/09.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Improve data collection system to ensure reliability and validity of data	a) Modify the ESS Annual Special Education Data Collection		1/1/10 – 3/1/10	ADE/ESS/EC SE
	b) Train PEAs about Annual Special Education Data Collection		3/1/10 – 6/1/10	ADE/ESS Data Management
	c) Add date of referral to AzEIP on the AzEIP forms used for transition meetings		1/1/10 – 6/30/10	AzEIP Staff
	d) Modify the ECSE process to verify correction of noncompliance		11/1/09 – 3/1/10	ADE/ECSE
	e) Train PEAs about changes to data collection, reporting, and verification		1/1/10 – 6/30/11	ADE/ECSE AzEIP

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: High School Transition

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

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

NOTE

- Arizona is not reporting actual target data for this indicator.
- Arizona is reporting on the correction of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2007 APR.

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 61%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	497
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	482
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	15

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance)

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	15
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	15
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The findings of noncompliance related to secondary transition have been corrected. The correction of all student specific and systemic noncompliance was verified by ESS program specialists. In order to ensure that compliance with regulatory requirements was sustained, ESS specialists made subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits during the open Corrective Action Plan to review new student files and interview PEA staff members.

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ESS uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes related to special education. The progressive enforcement actions taken by ESS for the PEAs that are unable to demonstrate compliance within one year from the date of written notification are as follows:

- 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.
- Assignment of a special monitor or, with ADE concurrence, permanent withholding of IDEA funds for a specific year. For charter schools not receiving federal 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.
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

FFY 2007 Verification of Correction from Monitoring

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted a minimum of three follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify correction of all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists again reviewed the specific student files from the recent monitoring to determine if IEPs had all secondary transition components that meet regulatory requirements.
- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed new files and conducted interviews with the special education administrators during subsequent visits and/or desk audits to determine if systemic changes occurred to ensure ongoing sustained compliance with regulatory requirements regarding secondary transition.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

Not applicable.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Post School Outcomes

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

- 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))

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

NOTE

- New baselines, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities will be established and submitted in the FFY 2009 APR for Indicator 14.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	Not applicable.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

Not applicable.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: Effective General Supervision

General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

89%

Arizona did not meet the target.

Process Used to Select PEAs for Monitoring

The ADE/ESS conducts compliance monitoring for IDEA procedural requirements on a six-year cycle. The data for FFY 2008 included the PEAs in year 5 of the cycle; that is; those PEAs that were on a Corrective Action Plan to correct findings of noncompliance identified at an on-site review during FFY 2007.

The PEAs monitored each year represent a regional balance across the State. The monitoring cycle year has a mix of elementary, unified, and union high school districts, charter schools, and other public agencies such as secure care, accommodation districts, or state institutions.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Explanation of Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona experienced slippage of 4% from FFY 2007 to FFY 2008 due to 14 PEAs that did not close out monitorings within the one-year timeline. These 14 PEAs, of the 85 PEAs monitored on-site, accounted for the 1,511 findings of noncompliance that were corrected later than one year. The Indicator 15 Worksheet (located at the end of this Indicator) gives details about the length of time needed to correct and verify the findings of noncompliance beyond the one-year timeline.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Monitoring Improvement Activities

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Revise ADE/ESS monitoring process and system to streamline tracking, verification, and reporting of noncompliance and correction	a) ADE/ESS Monitoring Team will revise monitoring process and system	Activities completed as of 7/24/09. Revision of monitoring system completed. Monitoring system increased focus on compliance and results indicator data, PEA determinations, dispute resolution findings, and technical assistance outcomes. ESS specialists reviewed data for every PEA in order to make decisions about the type of monitoring (data review, self assessment, or on site) in which the PEA will participate in year 4 of the 6-year cycle. PEAs in any year of the 6-year cycle may be moved to year 4 of the cycle if data warrant.	5/1/08 – 12/31/09	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team MPRRC DAC
	b) Field test revised monitoring system	Activities completed during school year 2009-2010. Minor revisions and adjustments will be made throughout the year, based on feedback from ESS specialists and the field.	1/1/10 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team
	c) Revise monitoring system based on results from field test		7/1/10 – 9/30/10	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

				MPPRC DAC
	d) Implementation of fully revised system and process		10/1/10 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team
	e) Collect and analyze data from revised monitoring system		10/1/10 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team

Dispute Resolution Improvement Activities

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Update procedures within the Dispute Resolution Unit to ensure noncompliance is continually corrected and verified within the one-year timeline	a) Update procedures to track correction and verification of noncompliance	Activities completed as of 7/1/08. The director updated the written procedures for the Dispute Resolution Unit.		ADE/ESS Director of Dispute Resolution
	b) Implement updated procedures to track correction and verification of noncompliance	Activities completed from 8/1/08 to 6/30/09. ESS Dispute Resolution Director worked with the Corrective Action Compliance Monitor (CACM) to ensure that correction of noncompliance was completed within the one-year timeline. Verification was done by CACM.	8/1/08 – 6/30/09	ADE/ESS Director of Dispute Resolution
	c) Analyze system information to determine if procedures are ensuring noncompliance is corrected and verified within the one-year timeline		7/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Director of Dispute Resolution

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance)

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	13755
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	12244
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	1,511

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance)

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1511
5. Number of findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1511
6. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Actions Taken If Noncompliance Not Corrected Within One-Year Timeline

When noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the ADE/ESS uses a variety of methods to ensure that all public agencies meet the requirements of State and federal statutes related to special education. The progressive enforcement actions taken by ESS for the PEAs that are unable to demonstrate compliance within one year from the date of written notification are as follows:

- 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.
- Assignment of a special monitor or, with ADE concurrence, permanent withholding of IDEA funds for a specific year. For charter schools not receiving federal 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.
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Although these enforcement actions are in place, the ESS monitoring system is designed to work with the PEAs to correct the findings of noncompliance within one year. ESS directors and specialists meet periodically throughout the year to discuss and better understand the PEAs' data pertaining to the APR indicators, student population, and other data elements. This information is used to make decisions about the type of monitoring and need for technical assistance for each PEA. The ESS specialists use the same data during their on-site visits to the education agencies to address concerns and offer resources.

Another form of technical assistance offered by ESS is the annual site visits by the ESS specialists. These are designed to assist PEAs with understanding the requirements for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Information from these visits is logged in a spreadsheet to track need for follow-up in all three areas. Also, the ESS transition specialists use the Indicator 13 data to target their trainings and grants.

The Monitoring Director, Facilitator, and Monitoring Team develop the monitoring manual and train the specialists and PEA staff according to consistent monitoring guidelines. A major component of the guidelines is Corrective Action Plan follow-up, which includes a strict schedule after an on-site monitoring to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.

The Early Childhood Special Education specialists also offer targeted technical assistance to districts that are not in compliance through individual trainings, monthly audits, and consultations. In addition, ESS specialists review files during their annual site visits to provide assistance and resources when needed.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)

Verification of Correction for Monitoring System (Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 13)

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted a minimum of three follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after each monitoring to verify correction of all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists again reviewed the student files from the recent monitoring to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance and are adhering to the regulatory requirements.
- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed new files and conducted interviews with the special education administrators during subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits to determine if systemic changes occurred that will ensure ongoing sustained compliance with regulatory requirements.

Verification of Correction for Early Childhood Transitions (Indicator 12)

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ECE specialists reviewed the written process and procedures for the PEAs' early intervention transitions.
- ADE/ESS specialists and/or ADE/ECE specialists reviewed student files during subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance and are adhering to the regulatory requirements.

Verification of Correction for Dispute Resolution (Indicators 16, 17, 18, and 19)

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- The Corrective Action Compliance Monitor (CACM) maintained a database of all corrective actions and tracked timelines to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

- The CACM reviewed each written action plan via desk audit to ensure that child specific cases and systemic noncompliance were corrected. Each PEA submitted all documentation evidencing that the noncompliance was corrected.
- The CACM reviewed each written action plan via desk audit to ensure that the PEAs were in compliance with regulatory requirements.

Verification of Correction for Other Related Requirements pertaining to Graduation, Dropout, Assessment, School Age and Preschool LRE, Preschool Outcomes, Parent Involvement, and Post School Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 14)

The methods Arizona used to verify that PEAs corrected all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements:

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted a minimum of three follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after each monitoring to verify correction of all instances of child specific and systemic noncompliance.
- ADE/ESS specialists again reviewed the student files from the recent monitoring to determine if the PEAs corrected all child specific and systemic noncompliance and are adhering to the regulatory requirements.
- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed new files and conducted interviews with the special education administrators during subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits to determine if systemic changes occurred that will ensure ongoing sustained compliance with regulatory requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 APR

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 APR—Indicator 4A

A review of the 2007–2008 suspension and expulsion data revealed one PEA having significant discrepancy. In accordance with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reviewed policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with requirements.

Arizona required the PEA with significant discrepancy 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. Also, the PEA was required to re-submit to ESS its policies and procedures related to the discipline requirements. A review determined the policies and procedures were in alignment with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.530 through §300.536.

The practices of the PEA were reviewed by means of a self assessment. The PEA conducted an assessment of its 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 desk audits during and after the self assessment to validate the accuracy of compliance calls. The specialists interviewed the special education administrator and reviewed student files to verify correction of student specific and systemic noncompliance and ensure sustained compliance with regulatory requirements.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

As a result of this review, the PEA was found to be in compliance with the regulatory requirements and the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 APR—Indicator 10

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 0.35%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	2
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	2
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance (two PEAs) were corrected within the one-year timeline. These two PEAs developed a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in collaboration with the ADE/ESS specialists. The ESS specialists verified correction of student specific and systemic noncompliance during on-site visits at both school districts. The school personnel at both school districts changed the necessary policies, procedures, and practices to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements pertaining to child find, evaluation, and eligibility.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	1
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	1
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has not verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The remaining FFY 2006 finding of noncompliance (one PEA) was corrected. This PEA received numerous on-site visits and desk audits from the ADE/ESS specialist to verify correction of child specific and systemic noncompliance. The specialist reviewed new student files during subsequent visits to verify sustained compliance. A special monitor, selected by the PEA from a list provided by the ADE, worked with the special education administrator to ensure systemic change resulted in compliance with the regulatory requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 APR—Indicator 11

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 89%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	84
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	65
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	19

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	19
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	19
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The 84 findings of noncompliance related to the 60-day evaluation timeline have been corrected. The correction of each child specific case of noncompliance was verified by ESS program specialists. In order to ensure that compliance with regulatory requirements was sustained, ESS specialists made subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits during the open Corrective Action Plan to review new student files and interview PEA staff members.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 APR—Indicator 12

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 98%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	12
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	12
3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The 12 PEAs submitted to ECSE the policies and procedures for early intervention transitions that were mutually agreed upon with the AzEIP service coordinators. All PEAs demonstrated three consecutive months of compliance with early childhood transitions. Verification of correction of the child specific and systemic noncompliance was done by ECSE and ESS specialists through on-site visits and/or desk audits for all the PEAs.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	2
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	2
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

These two PEAs submitted data through the Annual Special Education Data Collection documenting 100% compliance with early childhood transitions. Verification of correction of child specific and systemic noncompliance was done by ECSE specialists.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2007 APR—Indicator 13

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2007 for this indicator: 61%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008)	497
2. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	482

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

3. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	15
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance)

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	15
5. Number of FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	15
6. Number of FFY 2007 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

The findings of noncompliance related to secondary transition have been corrected. The correction of all student specific and systemic noncompliance was verified by ESS program specialists. In order to ensure that compliance with regulatory requirements was sustained, ESS specialists made subsequent on-site visits and/or desk audits during the open Corrective Action Plan to review new student files and interview PEA staff members.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance

If the State reported <100% for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR and did not report that the remaining FFY 2006 findings were subsequently corrected, provide the information below:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	28
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	28
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	0

One PEA accounted for the 28 findings. IDEA payments were interrupted and a special monitor was assigned. The PEA closed out its monitoring and corrected the child specific and systemic noncompliance. The school district was able to demonstrate sustained compliance with regulatory requirements by June 10, 2009.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2005 or Earlier

Not applicable.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following is a new improvement activity to improve the quality of the data from the monitoring system.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Ensure high quality data from the monitoring system	a) Align line items within monitoring system to the Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. The line items were aligned to the Related Requirements.	1/1/09 – 6/30/09	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team MPRRC DAC
	b) Increase interrater reliability of compliance line items related to Indicator 13	Activities completed from 10/1/08 to 11/30/09. Interrater reliability among ADE/ESS raters was 80% to 100% for each line item.	10/1/08 – 11/30/09	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team MPRRC DAC
	c) Increase validity and reliability of line items within monitoring system		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Monitoring Team MPRRC DAC

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

NOTE: Arizona's Indicator 15 Worksheet lists large numbers in the "Findings" columns because every student file reviewed can generate multiple findings of noncompliance associated with the related requirements.

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. 14. Percent of youth who had	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	Monitoring System: 75	Monitoring System: 1580	Monitoring System: 1362	89 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification 99 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification 23 corrected and verified within 18 months from identification 7 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
<p>IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 5 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to these three Indicators.</p>	<p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p>	<p>Complaints: 48 Due process: 2</p>	<p>Complaints: 31 Due process: 2</p>	<p>Complaints: 31 Due process: 2</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.</p> <p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved</p>	<p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 82</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 2444</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 2025</p>	<p>101 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification 143 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification 137 corrected and verified within 18 months from identification 38 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
<p>outcomes.</p> <p>The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 7 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to these two Indicators.</p>	<p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p>	<p>Complaints: 67 Due Process: 0</p>	<p>Complaints: 13 Due Process: 0</p>	<p>Complaints: 13 Due Process: 0</p>	
<p>4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.</p>	<p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 19 APR: 1</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 54 APR: 0</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 52 APR: 0</p>	<p>2 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
<p>The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 6 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to discipline.</p>	<p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p>	<p>Complaints: 8 Due Process: 0</p>	<p>Complaints: 4 Due Process: 0</p>	<p>Complaints: 4 Due Process: 0</p>	
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 - educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.</p>	<p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 82</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 3447</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 3041</p>	<p>90 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification 148 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification 133 corrected and verified within 18 months from identification 35 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 19 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to least restrictive environments for all children.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Complaints: 28 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 4 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 4 Due Process: 0	
8. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	Monitoring System: 81	Monitoring System: 3359	Monitoring System: 3085	57 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification 194 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification 23 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 15 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to parent involvement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Complaints: 46 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 15 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 15 Due Process: 0	

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 4 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to disproportionality.</p>	<p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 36</p> <p>APR: 1</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 314</p> <p>APR: 10</p> <p>NOTE: These 10 findings are counted in the Monitoring System total of 314 (above) because the 10 findings are from a FFY 2007 monitoring of the PEA.</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 308</p> <p>APR: 10</p> <p>NOTE: These 10 findings are counted in the Monitoring System total of 308 (above) because the 10 findings are from a FFY 2007 monitoring of the PEA.</p>	<p>4 corrected and verified within 14 months from identification</p> <p>1 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification</p> <p>1 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Complaints: 0 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 0 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 0 Due Process: 0	
11. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	Monitoring System: 78	Monitoring System: 1312	Monitoring System: 1227	16 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification 42 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification 27 corrected and verified within 23 months from identification
The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 18 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to not only Indicator 11, but also child find and the evaluation process.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Complaints: 49 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 15 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 15 Due Process: 0	

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
<p>12. 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.</p> <p>The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 4 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to early childhood transition.</p>	<p>Monitoring Activities: Data Collected by Census, Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 15</p> <p>Indicator 12 Census (early childhood transition): 12</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 30</p> <p>Indicator 12 Census (early childhood transition): 12</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 27</p> <p>Indicator 12 Census (early childhood transition): 12</p>	<p>3 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification</p>
	<p>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</p>	<p>Complaints: 0</p> <p>Due Process: 0</p>	<p>Complaints: 0</p> <p>Due Process: 0</p>	<p>Complaints: 0</p> <p>Due Process: 0</p>	
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p>	<p>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 45</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 1118</p>	<p>Monitoring System: 1020</p>	<p>13 corrected and verified within 13 months from identification</p> <p>38 corrected and verified within 16 months from identification</p> <p>47 corrected and verified within 18 months from identification</p>

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
The findings of noncompliance involve large numbers because Arizona's monitoring system generates findings associated with the related requirements. For example, 7 individual line items from the monitoring system comprise all the related requirements pertaining to the secondary transition process.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Complaints: 5 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 1 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 1 Due Process: 0	
Other areas of noncompliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	Monitoring System: 0	Monitoring System: 0	Monitoring System: 0	
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	Complaints: 0 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 0 Due Process: 0	Complaints: 0 Due Process: 0	
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			13,755	12,244	1,511

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of PEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings (individual student files) of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	# of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08) for which correction was verified later than one year from identification.
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.	$(12,244) / (13,755) \times 100 = 89\%$				

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Complaint Timelines

Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

Measurement

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

# of signed written complaints with reports issued within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint	# of signed written complaints	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
94	94	100%
$(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \div (1.1) * 100 = X$ $94 + 0 \div 94 = 1 * 100 = 100\%$		

Arizona met the target.

Data

Data Source

Data is the same as submitted under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Valid and Reliable Data

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The ADE/ESS collects and maintains the dispute resolution data in its internal database and assures the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the data. The dispute resolution data is the same as reported under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Explanation of Progress that Occurred for FFY 2008

During FFY 2008 Arizona issued 94 investigative reports. All reports were issued within the 60-day timeline. Progress is attributed to an improved tracking system maintained by the Dispute Resolution coordinator, and to the weekly monitoring of timelines by the Dispute Resolution director.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Establish a system requiring complaint investigators to submit a draft Letter of Findings for review to Dispute Resolution director no more than seven days prior to the 60-day deadline	a) Revise procedures for submission by complaint investigators of draft Letter of Findings for review to Dispute Resolution director	Activities completed as of 12/31/08. Internal procedures were revised and investigators were notified.	7/1/08 – 12/31/08	ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	b) Implement revised procedures for submission by complaint investigators of draft Letter of Findings for review to Dispute Resolution director no more than seven days prior to the 60-day deadline	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. Revised procedures are implemented. Investigators are submitting draft Letters prior to 60-day deadline for timely review.	1/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Due Process Timelines

Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

Measurement

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

# of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party	# of adjudicated due process hearing requests	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
3	3	100%
$(3.2 (a) + 3.2 (b)) \div (3.2) * 100 = X$ $2 + 1 \div 3 = 1 * 100 = 100\%$		

Arizona met the target.

Data

Data Source

Data is the same as submitted under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Valid and Reliable Data

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The ADE/ESS collects and maintains the dispute resolution data in its internal database and assures the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the data. The dispute resolution data is the same as reported under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Explanation of Progress that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona was able to maintain the 100% target as a result of tracking systems established by the Dispute Resolution Unit that monitors the 45-day timeline, in addition to ongoing communication between the director of Dispute Resolution and the Arizona Office of Administrative Hearings.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Establish system that requires the Administrative Law Judge to issue a minute entry specifying the "45 th day"	a) Revise procedures that require the Administrative Law Judge to issue a minute entry specifying the "45 th day"	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 12/31/08. Procedures were revised by Dispute Resolution director and Office of Administrative Hearings personnel.		ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director Arizona Office of Administrative Hearings
	b) Implement procedures that require the Administrative Law Judge to issue a minute entry specifying the "45 th day" to improve tracking of timelines and to ensure due process hearings are completed within the required timelines	Activities completed from 1/1/09 to 6/30/09. Procedures are implemented and Administrative Law Judges are issuing minute entries specifying the exact date.	1/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director Arizona Office of Administrative Hearings

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following is a new improvement activity which establishes a formal process to track 45-day due process hearing timelines.

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Develop a formal process to track 45-day hearing timelines	a) Develop a resolution session tracking form	Activity completed as of 12/15/09. Form developed by Dispute Resolution		ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director and Coordinator

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		director to track the effectiveness of resolution sessions.		
	b) Disseminate tracking form to each PEA upon the filing of a due process hearing		12/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director and Coordinator
	c) Use results of tracking form to determine beginning of 45-day timeline		12/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Dispute Resolution Director Arizona Office of Administrative Hearings

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Resolution Session Effectiveness

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))

Measurement

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

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	68%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

# of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements	# of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
26	31	83.9%
$(3.1 (a) \div 3.1) * 100 = X$ $26 \div 31 = 0.838 * 100 = 83.9\%$		

Arizona exceeded the target.

Data

Data Source

Data is the same as submitted under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS collects and maintains the dispute resolution data in its internal database and assures the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the data. The dispute resolution data is the same as reported under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7. Additionally, with guidance from OSEP, the Dispute Resolution

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

director manually tracked each due process hearing request for FFY 2008 to ensure that resolution sessions were held, unless properly waived or unless the parties agreed to participate in mediation. The director of Dispute Resolution also manually tracked the number of resolution sessions that resulted in resolution agreements. This comprehensive tracking involved the Dispute Resolution director reviewing each due process file individually and following up with school personnel as necessary for clarification.

Explanation of Progress that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona continues to make progress in this area due to the efforts of the Dispute Resolution Unit. The director and staff provided information about resolution sessions to school personnel and parents at the annual Directors Institute sponsored by the ADE-ESS. Also, the Directors Institute again asked Dr. Eric Hartwig, Ph.D., to share his expertise with attendees about negotiation strategies and techniques to resolve difficult problems.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Develop a survey to be given to parties that participate in a resolution session	a) Develop survey	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 9/1/08. Survey was developed by Dispute Resolution director.		ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	b) Field test survey and revise if appropriate	Activities completed as of 11/1/09. Survey was given to all participants in resolution sessions held during FFY 2008. Revisions considered but deemed not necessary at this time.	9/1/08 – 6/30/09	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	c) Implement survey for parties that participate in a resolution session		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

The following new improvement activity establishes a formal process to track the effectiveness of resolution sessions.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Track resolution sessions to determine effectiveness	a) Develop a resolution session tracking form	Activities completed as of 12/15/09. Form developed by Dispute Resolution director to track the effectiveness of resolution sessions.		ESS Dispute Resolution Director
	b) Disseminate tracking form to each PEA upon the filing of a due process hearing		12/1/09-6/30/11	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	c) Use results of tracking form to collect and report data for Dispute Resolution, Table 7		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ESS Dispute Resolution Director
2) Train PEAs and families on resolution sessions	a) Develop power point presentation for training PEAs and families	Activity completed as of 1/6/10. Power point presentation developed by Director of Dispute Resolution.		ESS Dispute Resolution Director
	b) Train PEAs at various conferences throughout the year		1/1/10 – 6/30/11	ESS Dispute Resolution Director
	c) Work with Arizona's PTI and ADE/ESS Parent Information Network Specialists (PINS) to train families throughout the year		1/1/10 – 6/30/11	ESS Dispute Resolution Director
	d) Train Administrative Law Judges on resolution sessions	Activity completed as of 12/31/09.	1/1/10 – 6/30/11	ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ESS Dispute Resolution Director External Consultant

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement

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

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	83.5%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

# of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements	# of mediations	Actual Target Data for FFY 2008
26	37	70.3%
$(2.1 (a) (i) + 2.1 (b) (i)) \div (2.1) * 100 = X$ $11 + 15 \div 37 = 0.7027 * 100 = 70.3\%$		

Arizona did not meet the target.

Data

Data Source

Data is the same as submitted under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS collects and maintains the dispute resolution data in its internal database and assures the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the data. The dispute resolution data is the same as reported under section 618, Dispute Resolution, Table 7.

Explanation of Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Arizona experienced slight slippage as compared to FFY 2007. The slippage may have been affected by the greater number of mediations filed and held during FFY 2008 than during FFY 2007. In an effort to increase the rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, the State conducted a Mediator Workshop on October 30, 2009. The workshop allowed the mediators to discuss topics relevant to their roles in dispute resolution.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Increase response rate to mediation survey	a) Train mediators about purpose and distribution of survey	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Although this activity was not completed within projected timeline, mediators learned about the survey during a workshop in 10/09.	7/1/08 – 6/30/09	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	b) Analyze response rate to mediation survey		7/1/09 – 6/30/10	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
2) Review and revise, if appropriate, mediation survey	a) Review mediation survey and results to determine participant satisfaction and feedback	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Survey was reviewed by Dispute Resolution director.	7/1/08 – 6/30/09	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	b) Revise mediation survey, if appropriate, based on review and analysis	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. Dispute Resolution director, after review and analysis, determined that revision of survey was not necessary.	7/1/09 – 9/1/09	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute Resolution Coordinator
	c) Implement revised survey	Activity completed as of 6/30/09.	9/1/09 – 6/30/11	ESS Dispute Resolution Director ESS Dispute

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

				Resolution Coordinator
--	--	--	--	---------------------------

Revisions, with Justification, to Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State Reported Data

State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator.

Target Data for FFY 2008

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2008

97.6%

Arizona did not meet the target.

Data

Data Source

Arizona collects the 618 data and the SPP/APR data through the following sources:

- Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), a Web-based system for the collection of all student data from the PEAs;
- Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) and Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards Alternate (AIMS A), the statewide student assessment system used by the Arizona Department of Education for AYP and AZ LEARNS determinations;

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

- Annual Special Education Data Collection, a Web-based system for PEAs to submit data on the personnel, exit, and discipline elements;
- The preschool assessment Web-based data collection system, the method for PEAs to submit preschool outcome data;
- Arizona Parent Survey, a Web-based system for parents to submit survey responses;
- Arizona Monitoring System, a Web-based system to collect monitoring data; and,
- Dispute Resolution spreadsheet to collect, maintain, and report all dispute resolution information.

Data Description

Based on the Part B Indicator 20 Self-Scoring Rubric, Arizona submitted timely and accurate data 97.6% of the time.

- Child Count and Placement, due February 1, 2009, was submitted on time and accurately. This data applied to Indicators 5, 6, 9, and 10.
- Assessment, due February 1, 2010, was submitted on time and accurately. This data applied to Indicator 3.
- Personnel, due November 1, 2009, was submitted on time and accurately.
- Exit, due November 1, 2009, was submitted on time and accurately. This data applied to Indicators 1 and 2.
- Discipline, due November 1, 2009, was submitted on time and accurately. This data applied to Indicator 4.
- Dispute Resolution, due November 1, 2009, was submitted on time but did not have complete data. Table 7 was resubmitted on December 17, 2009, with complete data. Table 7 applied to Indicators 16, 17, 18, and 19.
- Annual Performance Report, due February 1, 2010, was submitted on time and accurately.

Explanation of Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2008

Arizona experienced slippage of 0.1%. Arizona's Dispute Resolution, Table 7, due November 1, 2009, was submitted on time. However, ESS conducted a comprehensive manual review of due process hearing files following a November 2009 OSEP verification visit. Specifically, the director of Dispute Resolution reviewed all due process hearing files and determined that a greater number of resolution sessions took place than had been previously reported. Utilizing the resulting information, Table 7 was revised and resubmitted on December 17, 2009. The Indicator 20 Self-Scoring Rubric-618 Data reflects this resubmission.

As a result of the guidance from OSEP, Arizona developed an improvement activity for Indicators 17 and 18 establishing a formal process to track 45-day hearing timelines and resolution session effectiveness.

Although slippage occurred, Arizona has made progress with regard to accurate, valid, and reliable data collection, maintenance, and reporting by means of assistance to local school personnel. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator conducts workshops in regions throughout the State to teach participants how to use the State Web-based data systems and to emphasize the importance of data accuracy and timeliness. A total of 21 workshops were offered during this reporting year: ten trainings focused on child count and other data topics in fall 2008; and eleven trainings focused on annual data collection in spring 2009. In all, 694 attendees were trained through regional data workshops. A Web site is used to access historical data and to list a number of resources for data specialists and business managers (<http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/funding/datamanagement/DmHome.asp>).

Arizona has in place multiple validity and reliability checks and follows the principles of the Critical Elements document. The ADE/ESS uses the edit checks built into the data transmission sheets to ensure

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

accuracy. The State also investigates the unusual variances identified by DAC to determine the validity of the submitted information. ESS understands the importance of timely and accurate data and is taking steps to improve internal processes.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2008

Primary Activity (GOAL)	Sub-Activities (Objectives or Action Steps)	Timeline		Resources (Planned)
		Complete	Projected	
1) Review and revision of the ADE Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) to improve timely and accurate special education data	a) ADE/ESS will contribute funds toward the review and revision of SAIS	Activities completed from 10/1/08 to 6/30/09. The ADE/ESS contributed to the review and revision of SAIS by supporting FTE positions, including two programming analysts and an architect/project lead.	10/1/08 – 6/30/09	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Data Management Coordinator
	b) ADE/ESS will meet with Information Technology (IT) staff periodically to revise procedures as necessary and address problems	Activities completed from 3/1/09 to 6/30/09. The ESS/IT Technical Review Team met monthly to address SAIS and data issues, prioritize SAIS development projects, and review timelines for data submission.	3/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Data Management Coordinator IT Staff
	c) ADE/ESS will write business rules for the SAIS revisions	Activities completed from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09. ESS collaborated with IT business analysts to develop and revise rules for SAIS revisions on an as-needed basis.	7/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Data Management Coordinator IT Staff
	d) ADE/ESS will analyze SAIS operation for timely and accurate collection and reporting of special education data	Activities completed from 3/1/09 to 6/30/09. The ESS/IT Technical Review Team’s workgroup met monthly to address SAIS and data issues, prioritize SAIS development projects, and	7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Data

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

		review timelines for data submission.		Management Coordinator IT Staff
2) Refine ADE/ESS procedures for data aggregation	a) ADE/ESS will review and revise internal procedures for processing and reporting special education data	Activities completed from 3/1/09 to 6/30/09. ADE/ESS met with stakeholders periodically, established and reviewed timelines and procedures, identified issues, and resolved problems that affected processing of the special education data.	3/1/09 – 6/30/10	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Data Management Coordinator IT Staff
	b) ADE/ESS will analyze and refine internal procedures for processing and reporting special education data		7/1/09 – 6/30/11	ADE/ESS Deputy Associate Superintendent ADE/ESS Directors ADE/ESS Data Management Coordinator IT Staff

Revisions, with Justification, to Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008

No revisions for FFY 2008.

Part B - Indicator 20 Self-Scoring Rubric

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	*N/A	*N/A	0
14	*N/A	*N/A	0
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	34
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2008 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		39.00

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/10	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	0	1	N/A	2

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

	Subtotal	20
618 Score Calculation	Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.857) = 37.14	

Indicator 20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	39.00
B. 618 Grand Total	37.14
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	76.14
Total N/A in APR	4
Total N/A in 618	7
Base	78.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.976
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	97.6
Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 1.857 for 618	
*Call your State contact if you choose to provide data for Indicators 13 or 14	

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Attachments

The following are attachments to the FFY 2008 APR:

Attachment 1

- List of Acronyms

Attachment 2

- Dispute Resolution, Table 7

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Attachment 1: List of Acronyms

ADE	Arizona Department of Education
AIMS	Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards
AIMS A	Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards Alternate
ALJ	Administrative Law Judge
ARR	Alternate Risk Ratio
ASV	Annual Site Visit
AT	Assistive Technology
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
AzEIP	Arizona Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers
CACM	Corrective Action Compliance Monitor
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CoP	Communities of Practice
CSPD	Comprehensive System of Personnel Development
CTE	Career and Technical Education
CTT	Community Transition Team
DAC	Data Accountability Center
ECE	Early Childhood Education
ECSE	Early Childhood Special Education
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESS	Exceptional Student Services
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
Group B	Arizona Funding Category for Significant Disabilities
IDEA	The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

IDEAL	Integrated Data to Enhance Arizona's Learning
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IT	Information Technology
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MPRRC	Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center
NASDSE	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring
OAH	Office of Administrative Hearings
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs/U.S. Department of Education
PBISAz	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports of Arizona
PEA	Public Education Agency
PINS	Parent Information Network Specialist
PSO	Post School Outcome
R & E	Research and Evaluation
RTI	Response to Intervention
SAIS	Student Accountability Information System
SEAP	Special Education Advisory Panel
SETT	Student, Environment, Task, Technology
SFY	State Fiscal Year
SPDG	State Personnel Development Grant
SWD	Students with Disabilities
SW-PBIS	School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
TA	Technical Assistance
WRR	Weighted Risk Ratio

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

Attachment 2: Dispute Resolution, Table 7

SECTION A: WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS	
(1) Total number of written, signed complaints filed	126
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	94
(a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	51
(b) Reports within timeline	94
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	32
SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Total number of mediation requests received	51
(2.1) Mediations held	37
(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	15
(i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	11
(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	22
(i) Mediation agreements not related to due process	15
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	14
SECTION C: DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS	
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed	67
(3.1) Resolution meetings	31
(a) Written Settlement agreements	26
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated	3
(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	2
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	1
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	57
SECTION D: EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS (RELATED TO DISCIPLINARY DECISION)	
(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed	2
(4.1) Resolution meetings	0
(a) Written settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Part B Arizona Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008

The contents of this publication were developed with funds allocated by the U.S. Department of Education under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. These contents do not necessarily represent the guideline of the agency, nor should endorsement by the federal government be assumed.

The Arizona Department of Education of the State of Arizona does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, disability or age in its programs, activities or in its hiring and employment practices. For questions or concerns regarding this statement, please contact Administrative Services at 602-542-3186.

Printed in Phoenix, Arizona, by the Arizona Department of Education