

AZ  
Part B

FFY2016  
State Performance Plan /  
Annual Performance Report

The Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) system of general supervision comprises the following components: Program Support and Monitoring, Dispute Resolution, and Fiscal Monitoring. The general supervision system incorporates the shift to results-driven accountability and provides a balance between compliance and outcomes for students with disabilities. The 2016-2017 school year was Arizona's second year of the Examining Practices monitoring model.

The general supervision system is structured around collaborative conversations and technical assistance. **All schools** were involved in the following activities in the 2016–2017 transition year:

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

During the 2016–2017 school year, ADE reviewed data with local education agencies (LEAs) to determine general supervision activities. ADE/ESS used methods and procedures to carry out general supervision requirements that were consistent but flexible in order to adapt to the varying needs of children, educational settings, and administrative realities. When ADE reviewed data, LEA monitoring schedules were adjusted, and Examining Practices activities were assigned any time data indicated broad issues across systems.

#### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">arizona ssip clarification period april 27 2018.pdf</a>	Alissa Trollinger	4/27/2018 4:36 PM	
<a href="#">ta ffy 2016 memo 4 27 18.pdf</a>	Alissa Trollinger	4/27/2018 5:01 PM	

639

#### General Supervision System:

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

#### Exceptional Student Services Monitoring Model

Examining Practices is Arizona's system of general supervision and oversight of policies, procedures, and practices of all local education agencies (LEAs) in the state. Examining Practices is based on data analysis of risk factors, and its use supports our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The risk analysis process is used to assess the levels of need of local education agencies (LEAs) and the support they need to improve student outcomes and procedural compliance. Our focus at ESS is to build LEAs' capacity for internal supervision systems and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Program specialists assigned to the district or charter school will meet with the LEA director each spring to discuss the LEA data to plan for any upcoming examining practices activities.

The activities involved in Examining Practices include the following actions:

- Ensuring that LEAs maintain procedural compliance with IDEA so that a free appropriate public education (FAPE) is delivered in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for all students with disabilities.
- Using the Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement (EDISA) process.
- Collaborating with LEAs in strengthening their internal systems of supervision.
- Focusing discussions with LEAs on using the data-use framework to advance outcomes for students.
- Making connections through data analysis and file review.
- Delivering technical assistance to increase or build sustainability.
- Basing professional development on the LEAs needs for building its own capacity.
- Collecting indicator, child find, and student file review data.

By aligning the work we do in a continuous improvement process, ESS has created a new goal. This goal is to create a system that balances the protection of students' rights with improving educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

#### Accountability

As participants in the EDISA process, LEAs should demonstrate adherence to the following expectations:

- Work as a team.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Ensure that LEA leadership is present at all events.
- Attend and hold monthly Data Action Team (DAT) meetings.
- Ensure that all team members participate in all workshops and DAT meetings.
- Complete ALL activities with fidelity.
- Review the procedural requirements of IDEA.
- Engage in ongoing data analysis.
- Adhere to deadlines to complete documents.
- Complete the EDISA five-year process with fidelity.
- Provide data when requested for progress monitoring.

As participants in the Guided Support plan development, the LEA has the following expectations:

- Work as a team.
- Ensure that all team members participate in all activities.
- Complete ALL activities with fidelity.
- Review the procedural requirements of IDEA.
- Engage in ongoing data analysis.
- Adhere to deadlines to complete documents.

As participants in the 5% Policies and Procedures Monitoring, LEAs should be actively involved and complete all required activities to review the procedural requirements of IDEA.

In accordance with the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP's) 09/02 memo ( <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcitrs/osep09-02timelycorrectionmemo.pdf> ), when noncompliance is found by a state agency, the LEA is required to correct the noncompliance. Any LEA team participating in one of the three programs will have 60 days to correct all identified areas of noncompliance. If the identified areas of noncompliance are not corrected within the 60-day timeframe, the following will apply:

- **EDISA (Direct Support)** – Written Notification of Findings will be sent to the LEA and the LEA will develop a Corrective Action Plan.
- **Guided Support Monitoring** – Written Notification of Findings will be sent to the LEA and the LEA will develop a Corrective Action Plan.
- **5% Policies and Procedures Monitoring** – Written Notification of Findings will be sent to the LEA and the LEA will develop a Corrective Action Plan.

When the Written Notification of Findings is sent to an LEA, the LEA will have one year to correct all identified noncompliance from the date of the completed file review.

### Enforcement Activities

If the LEA participating in one of the monitoring types does not complete all required accountability activities, the following progression of enforcement actions is taken:

The assigned program specialist has a conversation identifying the issue(s) with the special education director. A resolution is developed as the next step to address the current issue(s). The ADE/ESS director sends a letter acknowledging the identified issue(s) and resolutions. The superintendent/charter holder is sent a copy of the letter.

A team from ADE/ESS (the ESS director and the program specialist) and the LEA (the special education director and the superintendent/charter holder) meet to address continuing issues and resolutions and how the LEA's performance affects the school's grade.

### Dispute Resolution

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

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

When both parties to a State administrative complaint agree that a mutually beneficial resolution can be reached without the need for a full investigation, the assigned complaint investigator may assist the parties in reaching an informal resolution. Although no formal resolution agreement is required, if the complaining party is satisfied with the PEAs response to the complaint, he or she may choose to

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

withdraw the complaint. If the complaining party changes his or her mind about informal resolution and wants the investigation to go forward, the individual may notify the Dispute Resolution office within five business days of withdrawing the complaint and the investigation will move forward.

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

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

### **Incentives, Sanctions, and Enforcement**

#### **Incentives Related to Monitoring**

During FFY 2015, the State offered the following incentives for PEAs that, upon completion of their monitoring, exhibited exemplary compliance with IDEA requirements:

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

#### **Sanctions and Enforcement Related to Monitoring**

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

- ESS development of a prescribed corrective action plan (CAP) with required activities and timelines to address the continuing noncompliance.
- Enforcement of CAP activities as outlined in the current CAP.
- Review and revision of the current CAP to develop targeted activities that address the continuing noncompliance.
- Assignment of a special monitor.
- Interruption of IDEA payments until adequate compliance is achieved. For charter schools not receiving IDEA funds, a request to begin withholding 10% of State funds.
- For charter schools, a request to the appropriate board for a notice of intent to revoke the charter.
- With Arizona State Board of Education approval, interruption of Group B weighted State aid or redirection of funds pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.227(a).
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

#### **Sanctions and Enforcement Related to Dispute Resolution**

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

1. Within five business days following the due date specified in the Letter of Corrective Action, the Director of Compliance and Training will attempt to informally communicate with the PEA via phone calls and/or emails for the following purpose(s):
  - to inquire as to why the corrective action is incomplete and to direct the PEA to immediately submit the completed corrective action documentation;
  - to provide feedback on any concerns with the documentation submitted, to give clarification on the requirements, and to direct the PEA to revise and resubmit the corrective action documentation within a specified timeframe; or
  - to inquire as to why the corrective action has not been submitted and to direct the PEA to immediately submit the completed corrective action documentation.
2. If the delay in submitting the documentation is due to extenuating circumstances and the Director of Compliance and Training determines based on those circumstances that it is reasonable to negotiate a new due date for the corrective action to be submitted, the Director of Compliance and Training will send a Letter of Understanding or an email, with a copy to the complainant, detailing (a) the Director of Compliance and Training's concerns and the PEAs explanation, (b) any decisions made to resolve the problem, and (c) a new negotiated due date.
2. If the concerns were not resolved using the informal procedures described above, the Director of Compliance and Training will send a Letter of Inquiry to the PEA, with a copy provided to the complainant. A Letter of Inquiry may be sent for any of the following reasons:

- The PEA is nonresponsive to the Director of Compliance and Training's attempts at informal communication.
  - The Director of Compliance and Training and the PEA are not able to resolve concerns with the content of corrective action documentation submitted or the PEAs failure to submit all required corrective action documentation through informal communication.
  - The Director of Compliance and Training is not satisfied with the PEAs response to informal inquiries for reasons such as the PEA does not intend to complete and submit the corrective action, the PEA refuses to make needed changes to corrective action documentation, or the PEAs informal explanation of the circumstances causing the delay in submitting corrective action documentation is unacceptable to the Director of Compliance and Training.
  - The PEA fails to submit new or revised corrective action documentation within the informally negotiated timeframe or by the new due date set forth in the Letter of Understanding or email.
  - In other cases determined necessary and appropriate by the Director of Compliance and Training.
  - The PEA must provide a Letter of Explanation to the Director of Compliance and Training within three business days of receipt of the Letter of Inquiry fully answering the inquiry and explaining the circumstances surrounding the non-submission of or failure to complete the corrective action documentation.
  - If the circumstances are acceptable, then the Director of Compliance and Training will send a Letter of Understanding, with a copy to the complainant, detailing (a) the Director of Compliance and Training's concerns and the PEAs explanation, (b) any decisions made to resolve the problem, and (c) a new negotiated due date. If the circumstances are unacceptable or the PEA does not respond to the Letter of Inquiry as noted above, then the Director of Compliance and Training will compose a Letter of Enforcement.
3. If the corrective action documentation submitted was not completed as specified in the Letter of Corrective Action and following informal communication between the Director of Compliance and Training and the PEA, the revised and resubmitted corrective action documentation was not satisfactory, the Director of Compliance and Training will inform the PEA via Letter of Clarification, with a copy to the complainant, that the corrective action item in question must be revised. A new due date for the revised corrective action will be assigned in this letter and technical assistance will be offered.
  4. If, after the steps outlined above have been taken, the corrective action documentation received remains incomplete or has not been received by ADE/Dispute Resolution or the corrective action has not been completed as specified in the Letter of Corrective Action, the Director of Compliance and Training will send a Letter of Enforcement to the chief administrator of the PEA, with a copy to the special education director or coordinator and the complainant, detailing the corrective action items that are incomplete, the corrective action items that were not completed as specified in the Letter of Corrective Action, or those items that have not been received.

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

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

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

### ESS Fiscal Monitoring

The ADE serves as the pass-through entity and fiscal/cognizant agency for Arizona's IDEA grant. Within the Grants Management Division, the Fiscal Monitoring Unit is charged with performing periodic fiscal reviews for all education agencies within the State of Arizona that receive grant awards passed through ADE for special education. The goals are to ensure education agencies use sound management practices as public stewards of federal funds, assist the agencies to meet compliance with Federal IDEA program requirements and federal grant guidelines, and to provide assistance to the agencies as necessary.

Pursuant to 2 CFR §200.331, as a Federal grant pass-through agency, ADE is responsible for monitoring the activities of subrecipients to ensure the subaward is used for authorized purposes, in compliance with Federal and State statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the subaward. The Federal Uniform Administrative Requirements mandate ADE monitor subrecipients. Monitoring includes:

1. Review of financial reports provided by the subrecipient
2. Follow-up to ensure timely and appropriate actions by subrecipients with deficiencies pertaining to the Federal award, as detected through audits, on-site reviews, and other means
3. Issuing management decisions for audit findings pertaining to the Federal award
4. Depending on ADE's assessment of compliance and/or risk, providing subrecipients with training and technical assistance

ADE's fiscal and programmatic monitoring/audit review focuses on four main areas of compliance:

1. **Grant Expenditures – Payroll & Non-Payroll**

- Review of Expenditures and Cash Management — monitoring/audit ensures cash management/flow correlates with

**2. Time and Effort**

- Time & Effort Reporting — monitoring/audit ensures there is an adequate level of Time and Effort documentation for all salaries charged to the ESS Grant

**3. Fixed Assets**

- Fixed Assets — monitoring/audit includes a physical review of assets purchased using ESS Grant funds (if applicable)

**4. Grants Management & Internal Control**

- Administrative and Financial Recordkeeping — monitoring/audit ensures there is a solid internal control system in place for maintaining documentation
- Adherence to Reporting Guidelines — monitoring/audit reviews timeliness of financial reporting

The Fiscal Review process is divided into three possible stages:

**1. Stage One – Desk Review:**

- All LEAs selected for Review will experience a Stage One Desk Review

**2. Stage Two – Expanded Desk Review:**

- If the Grant Expenditure reports do not match the corresponding Grant Completion Report, or if the Risk Assessment indicates internal control weaknesses, the LEA is moved to a more comprehensive Stage Two Desk Review.

**3. Stage Three – On-Site Fiscal Review:**

- A Stage Three Review may result if a Stage Two Desk Review indicates an LEA would benefit from an on-site visit by a Monitoring Auditor to personally discuss compliance areas of concern, or for the Monitoring Auditor to provide technical assistance.
- However, if the risk factors for an LEA indicate significant compliance concerns, the Monitoring Auditor may proceed directly to a Stage Three On-Site Review.

Following an on-site review, ADE will complete a Final Determination Letter that details any findings (which are also discussed during the Exit Conference). A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) may need to be developed to address the audit findings. The findings and the CAP will become part of the LEAs permanent file maintained by the ADE and subject to federal review. Failure to fulfill any component of the CAP as approved may result in additional consequences including discontinuance of funding.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

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

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Professional Development System:**

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

**Professional Development System**  
The Arizona Department of Education Exceptional Student Services solicits feedback from constituents to identify needs in professional

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

development and technical assistance. Needs are also identified through the evaluation of indicator data and the assessment of compliance with legal mandates. Based on those needs, ESS provides professional development and technical assistance using various instructional designs. ESS's professional development promotes active engagement, focuses on increasing educator effectiveness, and applies learning theories, research, and models. Delivery models for training include single and multi-year implementation grants, face-to face professional development, online professional development and online modules, and training that is delivered to groups of any size or to individuals. Participants in all trainings and presentations are surveyed to determine whether preparation, training design, materials, and outcomes met professional learning standards. Survey feedback is routinely reviewed and used to revise or develop subsequent training and presentations.

### **LETRS: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and**

**Modules 1–3 November 1–4, 2016**

**Modules 1–3 Webinar—December 6, 2016**

**Modules 1–3 Training of Trainers (TOT)—January 10–13, 2017**

**Modules 1–3 TOT Coaching—February 6–7, 2017**

**Modules 4–6 February 27–March 2, 2017**

**Modules 4–6 Webinar —March 29, 2017**

**Modules 4–6 TOT—May 1–4, 2017**

**Modules 4–6 TOT Coaching—June 13–14, 2017**

The training dates above represent the first year of LETRS Cohort 3 training facilitated by the Arizona Department of Education. LETRS training is an opportunity for intensive professional development that increases teacher knowledge of literacy through the Training of Trainers (TOT) model. Participants were primarily instructional coaches and school district leaders who are responsible for providing professional development in their school, district, or charter. They were provided with comprehensive and practical knowledge of how children learn to read, write, and spell, and participants are then expected to deliver trainings at their school sites upon successful completion of each module assessment. Teachers and administrators can use the knowledge acquired to improve instruction and implement evidence-based literacy interventions.

### **A Principal's Primer for Raising Reading Achievement**

**June 7–8, 2017**

In collaboration with Voyager Sopris Learning, Arizona Department of Education's Exceptional Student Services hosted a two-day leadership training on improving reading achievement. This training was a "how-to" professional development opportunity for district and school administrators who wanted to improve the overall reading performance of an elementary or middle school population. The training provided practical instruction on how a principal can lead a school to implement research-based, multi-tiered reading instruction and achieve optimal results, especially with students with disabilities and students from economically, socially, or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. The target audience was principals and district-level administrators.

### **The Arizona State Personnel Development Grant**

**Module 1—August 17, 2016, August 19, 2016, August 24, 2016, August 25, 2016**

**Module 2—October 13, 2016, October 14, 2016, October 17, 2016, October 24, 2016, November 4, 2016, November 14, 2016, November 16, 2016, November 30, 2016**

**Module 3—January 5, 2017, March 6, 2017, March 8, 2017, March 27, 2017, March 31, 2017, April 12, 2017, April 19, 2017, April 27, 2017**

The Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS), received a grant from the Office of Special Education Programs to support a new online comprehensive training plan to close the identified gap in reading achievement for students with specific learning disabilities and their nondisabled peers in grades

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
4–8 throughout Arizona. The comprehensive professional learning program supports district systems change through a series of professional learning phases incorporating demystifying disabilities, special and general education collaboration, data-driven decisions, effective inclusionary practices, co-planning, and adolescent reading strategies. Each module includes professional learning for the District Leadership Team and a parent component so that parents are included as active partners in the systems change process. All training is supported by coaching from an implementation coach and a literacy coach at each site. During the 2016–2017 school year, Modules 1–3 were delivered to teams at the Arizona Department of Education and all leadership and staff in grades 4–8 at select sites as well as district leadership team members from the Parker Unified School District, the Glendale Elementary School District, and the Cartwright School District.

### **SWIS (School-Wide Information System) Training**

**July 28, 2016—Mountain Vista School, Oro Valley (SWIS & CICO-SWIS)**

**August 3, 2016—Parker Unified District (SWIS)**

**August 4, 2016—Mohave Valley Elementary District (SWIS)**

**August 15, 2016—Peach Springs Unified District (SWIS)**

**Sept. 19, 2016—Skyline Ranch Elementary, Florence Unified District (CICO-SWIS)**

**Sept. 20, 2016—Cartwright Elementary District (SWIS & CICO-SWIS)**

**Sept. 21, 2016—Buckeye Elementary District (I-SWIS)**

**Oct. 26, 2016—Fireside Elementary, Paradise Valley Unified District (SWIS)**

**Oct. 27, 2016—Avalon Elementary, Excalibur Charter Schools (SWIS)**

**Dec. 14, 2016—Raul Grijalva Union Unified District (I-SWIS)**

**Jan. 5, 2017—Fort Huachuca Accommodation District (SWIS)**

**Feb. 1, 2017—Buckeye Elementary District (I-SWIS booster training)**

The SWIS Suite is a reliable, confidential, web-based information system that enables schools to collect, summarize, and use student behavior data for decision making. SWIS assists teams in improving their internal decision making and overall support plan design for individual students and their families. School teams are guided through the initial training process to utilize this data system at their school site(s). The SWIS Suite includes the following:

School-Wide Information System (SWIS)—A system for school-wide behavior data

Check-In Check-Out (CICO-SWIS)—A system for data collection for students receiving Tier 2 supports

Individual SWIS (I-SWIS)—A system for data collection for students receiving Tier 3 supports

### **Multi-Tier Behavior Supports (MTBS aka PBIS)**

**Year 1: S1: Sept. 1–2, 2016, S2: Dec. 8–9, 2016, S3: Feb. 27–28, 2017**

**Year 2: S1: Sept. 22–23, 2016, S2: Nov. 17–18, 2016, S3: Jan. 26–27, 2017, S4: Feb. 16–17, 2017**

**Year 3: S1: Sept. 8–9, 2016, S2: Nov. 3–4, 2016, S3: Jan. 12–13, 2017, S4: Feb. 23–24, 2017**

**MTBS Coaches: Nov. 14, 2016 (Year 3 coaches), Dec. 12–13, 2016 (Year 2 coaches), Jan. 9–10, 2017 (Years 2 & 3 Coaches)**

Multi-Tier Behavior Supports is a three-year training that assists school teams with the development of a school-wide approach for positive behavior management practices. This training is based on School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)** and Support (SW-PBIS) evidence-based elements. Year 1 focuses on designing the universal (Tier 1) plan. Year 2 focuses on designing targeted (Tier 2) interventions for students. Year 3 focuses on designing the intensive (Tier 3) interventions for students. Additional coaching training is provided for one team member beginning in year 2 to assist in supporting the sustainability of the system.

### **School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET) Training**

**November 21, 2016—Holbrook Unified District**

The school-wide evaluation tool is a tool used to measure the level of implementation of Tier 1 of PBIS. This training involved defining the procedures of administering the tool and how to examine the documents that were provided by the site. After the initial seat work training, each assessor must shadow and score an actual SET administered by the ADE MTBS specialist at a school site to make sure there is inter-rater reliability before trainees administer a SET independently. This training is provided as part of the MTBS coaches' training listed above. Additional SET training is provided at the request of districts or groups to establish a cadre of district personnel able to administer SETS.

### **Check-In, Check-Out (CICO) & Bully Prevention Training**

**Jan. 18, 2017—Santa Cruz County, Nogales, AZ**

Check In-Check Out is an evidence-based Tier 2 behavior intervention for students who are seeking adult attention. This training provides an overview of the intervention and guides teams through the process of creating a CICO system designed to meet the needs of students at their site.

The Bully Prevention Training gives teams the tools to create a Bully Prevention system that is geared to the needs of students at their site. It helps teachers extinguish bullying through the blending of PBIS, explicit instruction, and a redefinition of the bullying construct.

### **School Resource Officer Training**

**September 14, 2016**

**January 25, 2017**

School resource officers (SROs) are placed in selected schools to contribute to safe school environments that are conducive to teaching and learning. These resource officers maintain a visible presence on campus, deter delinquent and violent behaviors, serve as available resources to the school community, and provide students and staff with law-related education (LRE) instruction and training. One aspect of training for SROs was providing them with understanding and knowledge of special education, types of services provided to students receiving special education services, and strategies to support students in the various exceptionality areas.

### **Arizona Statewide Autism Project (AzSAP)**

**August 23–25, 2016**

**September 13–15, 2016**

**September 27–29, 2016**

**October 4–6, 2016**

ADE Exceptional Student Services and ADE Early Childhood work in collaboration with STAR Autism Support to provide training that supports the educational needs of students with significant learning challenges, including those students with autism spectrum disorder. The STAR (Strategies for Teaching based on Autism Research) Program, developed by Arick, Loos, Falco, and Krug (2004) is a comprehensive curriculum that includes detailed lesson plans, teaching materials, data systems, and a curriculum-based assessment for teaching in the six curricular areas of receptive language, expressive language, spontaneous language, functional

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

routines, academics, and play and social skills. The strategies used in the STAR Program have been shown to be effective with students at the preschool and elementary level.

The LINKs curriculum is also presented by STAR Autism Support and is targeted to secondary students and staff. STAR Support trains on curricula and interventions based on the principles of applied behavior analysis. STAR Support strives to provide instructors with the tools to implement effective curricula for a wide range of learners with autism spectrum disorder. The focus of the training and curricula is on the child and the functional skills he or she needs to learn to be an active, engaged member of the school, home, and community. Capacity-building and coaching-training support is also offered to all districts that participate.

### **Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Training**

**TBI 505 (Co-morbid Conditions after Brain Insult)—April 28-29, 2017—Southeastern Arizona**

**TBI 505—May 2, 2017, and May 4, 2017—Central Arizona**

**TBI 303 (Executive Function Weaknesses)—May 12–13, 2017—Southeastern Arizona**

**TBI Summer Conference—June 22-23, 2017—Northern Arizona**

The TBI training educated local professionals on the core issues related to traumatic brain injury (TBI), including incidence, prevalence, injury mechanisms, impacts, “red flags” of previous injury, and differences between congenital injuries, non-traumatic injuries, and various cognitive disabilities. The training served to increase awareness of the need to identify students with TBI in the schools using uniform screening procedures and to increase the capacity of professionals to assess, accurately determine eligibility, and provide appropriate services for students with traumatic brain injury and acquired brain injuries. Participants in the training learned how to more effectively participate in child study teams and multidisciplinary evaluation team meetings and how to analyze assessment data to appropriately plan for in-class accommodations, modifications, and intervention strategies. They also increased their knowledge about cognitive and behavioral interventions after a brain injury and expanded their knowledge of existing resources.

### **Training on Universal Design for Instruction (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction (DI) in Mathematics**

**January 21, 2017—Mathematics Educator Appreciation Day Conference**

**February 3, 2017—Inclusive Practices Institute**

**February 13, 2017—Tucson Unified School District**

**February 16, 2017—Tucson Unified School District**

**March 1, 2017—Tucson Unified School District**

**March 29, 2017—UDL-IRN(Implementation and Research Network) Summit**

**April 19, 2017 —La Paloma Charter Schools**

**June 13, 2017—Teachers’ Institute Conference**

**June 19–20, 2017—Tucson Unified School District**

**June 26–27, 2017—Tucson Unified School District**

The UDL and DI trainings focused on the best research-based techniques teachers can employ to help any struggling student, and particularly to help those with disabilities, become successful in mathematics at their grade level. The training taught best practices for differentiating instruction and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) by incorporating manipulatives, utilizing engaging apps, and modifying curriculum in intentional ways (to align with IEP goals). More specifically, participants were provided with examples of these research-based instructional practices and

## **FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

activities aligned to key target standards at multiple grade levels. The goal was to inspire and equip educators to help ensure that all students have access to high levels of mathematics and that all students have the best opportunities to be successful in their mathematics courses.

### **Directors' Institute**

#### **September 18–20, 2016**

The Directors' Institute 2016: *Every Student, Every Moment: Leadership for Results* provided 45 individual sessions over two-and-a-half days. Sessions centered on topics and current issues facing special education directors in Arizona, including trauma-informed practices, strategies for struggling readers, management of staff, and funding. All information provided was current and timely, and participants received resources that could be used immediately. The Directors' Institute reached over 600 participants from district and charter schools in Arizona.

### **Teachers' Institute**

#### **June 12–13, 2017**

The Teachers' Institute reached 300 general education and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and interventionists. The Institute is aligned to the Arizona Department of Education's Leading Change Conference and promotes common vocabulary, shared understanding, and a clear focus for educators looking to improve outcomes for students. Using both nationally recognized experts and local speakers, the conference provided both in-depth sessions for skill development and poster sessions for participants to get an idea about programs they'd like to investigate further. Resources for all participants were made available and materials were distributed electronically on the ADE website.

### **ECAP/School Counseling**

During the 2016–2017 school year, the Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP)/School Counseling staff offered these learning and program improvement opportunities to educators:

1. In cooperation with the Career and Technology Education (CTE) section at ADE and funded with external partnership money, the staff created a new ECAP Tracker Report housed within the AzCIS system. Arizona supports postsecondary success for all students and has adopted Education and Career Action Plans as a means for helping all students plan for their future. The ECAP process results in a student portfolio that documents several years of exploration, activity, and goal setting. With ECAP Tracker, administrators can determine which activities and documents comprise a complete portfolio at each grade level, then track students' completion of these components. This reporting tool recently was promoted live on all middle and high school AzCIS sites. Once educators are familiar with the tool, staff will offer webinars and trainings in 2018.
2. Site visits to provide technical assistance and discuss the school's Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP) process and related documents were completed. Additionally, we offered technical assistance on webinars and over the phone.
3. Regional ECAPs: Moving from Compliance to Culture 2.0 workshops/trainings were offered throughout the year. Many Arizona school teams and other individuals attended these FREE half-day sessions.
4. AzCIS (Arizona Career Information System) was provided free to all K–12 public education and charter schools to use this valuable online planning resource for students' career and educational planning needs. A variety of venues were available to meet a variety of training needs: face-to-face workshops, regional trainings, school site trainings, and conferences. Monthly webinars hosted in Blackboard were also offered to educators.
5. Regional College and Career Ready trainings were provided for school counselors and school educators. The trainings covered the following topics:
  - Workplace Employability Skills
  - Career and Technology Education (CTE)—Programs of Study; What Is College and Career Readiness for ALL Students?
  - Using the ECAP Planning Process and Resources for CCR (College and Career Readiness)
  - The Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)
  - Using Your School College and Career Ready Data to Make Change
  - Using AzCIS for ECAPs
  - ECAPs and Transition Plans: How Different or the Same?
6. With continued CTE Innovation Grant money, all four modules of the Arizona Career Ready Program were implemented. Modules were offered online in ADE Blackboard, face-to-face or in a blended format, and in sampler modules at conferences. Five trained facilitators taught the modules throughout the year. The professional development opportunities were available for teachers, school counselors, CTE personnel, and administrators.
7. ADE ESS and CTE staff, with external partners, offered trainings and conference sessions centered on these topics:

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Using AzCIS for Career and Educational Planning
- ECAPs and Transition Plans
- ESS, CTE Programs, Placement, and the Law

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The annual performance report (APR) on the State’s progress and/or slippage for FFY 2015 is available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/> under the list titled Annual Performance Report. The title of the APR is *Arizona FFY 2015 Annual Performance Report*.

The annual public reports were available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/> under the list titled Public Reports School Year 2015–2016, within 120 days of the February 2, 2017, submission of the APR. These reports list the performance of each school district and charter school in Arizona on the SPP targets.

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

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">ta ffy 2016 memo 4 27 18.pdf</a>	Alissa Trollinger	4/27/2018 4:33 PM	
<a href="#">arizona ssp clarification period april 27 2018.pdf</a>	Alissa Trollinger	4/27/2018 4:34 PM	

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

### OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information. However, OSEP notes that in its attachment, the State reported target years through FFY 2019 instead of FFY 2018, as required by the measurement table. In addition, the targets reported in the attachment are inconsistent with the targets reported for Indicator 17 in GRADS 360.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). The State must also provide Indicator 17 targets through FFY 2018 and, if the State chooses to report Indicator 17 targets in both GRADS 360 and an attachment, the State must ensure that the information provided is consistent. Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its 7/2/2018

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR

### Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2017 and 2018 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2018 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			62.50%	63.00%	64.50%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data		61.00%	60.40%	63.00%	64.00%	64.90%	65.80%	67.00%	65.00%	62.72%	63.34%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	80.00%
Data	64.42%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, and representatives from charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	5,434	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	7,878	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	68.98%	Calculate <span style="background-color: gray; border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 10px; height: 10px;"></span>

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
5,434	7,878	64.42%	80.00%	68.98%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Graduation Conditions**

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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

**Conditions to Graduate with a Regular Diploma**

Conditions students without disabilities must meet to graduate with regular high school diplomas:

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

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

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

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.00%	4.90%	28.07%	28.00%
Data		5.59%	4.20%	3.60%	7.50%	4.80%	4.66%	4.70%	5.90%	28.07%	24.09%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	27.90%
Data	25.17%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	27.80%	27.70%	26.80%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

In addition to the SEAP’s suggestions, ESS requested input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	4,301	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	null	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	34	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	1,596	null
SY 2015-16 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/1/2017	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</a>	14	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
 FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1,596	5,945	25.17%	27.80%	26.85%

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

Arizona uses the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic (NCES) Common Core of Data. A high school dropout is defined as an individual who meets all: (1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; (2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; (3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transferred to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); (b) temporarily absent due to suspension or school-excused illness; or (c) died.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.50%	97.00%	97.10%	97.60%	98.60%	97.40%	98.60%	98.60%	98.60%	97.44%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			97.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		98.50%	96.90%	97.00%	97.50%	98.50%	97.30%	98.50%	98.50%	98.53%	98.19%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	93.60%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	92.29%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

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

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

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	12448	12528	12242	11550	10665	10253	n	n	556	n	8259
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4329	3952	3725	3459	3469	3472					5520
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6644	7155	7043	6582	5659	5120					1735
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	776	766	807	779	736	809			556		

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	12448	12528	12242	11550	10665	10253	n	n	583	n	8232
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4236	3908	3670	3463	3568	3495					5598
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6824	7262	7133	6631	5596	5139					1279
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	788	773	822	799	758	826			583		

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	78,501	73,093	93.60%	95.00%	93.11%

### FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	78,501	73,151	92.29%	95.00%	93.18%

### Public Reporting Information

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

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

The FFY 2016 Annual Performance Report (APR) gives information about the participation of students with IEPs. The APR is located on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/> under the list titled Annual Performance Report.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	
Reading	A Grade 3	2014	Target ≥						62.60%	71.90%	77.00%	80.00%	85.00%	87.00%	
			Data						36.30%	43.10%	40.60%	40.70%	41.55%	16.80%	
	B Grade 4	2014	Target ≥							56.00%	67.00%	76.00%	56.00%	84.00%	87.00%
			Data							34.10%	42.70%	41.50%	34.10%	41.18%	15.40%
	C Grade 5	2014	Target ≥							54.60%	65.90%	80.00%	54.60%	87.00%	89.00%
			Data							30.30%	42.10%	39.80%	30.30%	42.29%	10.82%
	D Grade 6	2014	Target ≥							56.00%	67.00%	82.00%	56.00%	88.00%	90.00%
			Data							33.20%	41.10%	40.80%	33.20%	41.45%	9.60%
	E Grade 7	2014	Target ≥							59.20%	69.40%	83.00%	59.20%	89.00%	91.00%
			Data							31.00%	43.30%	44.20%	31.00%	50.74%	9.13%
	F Grade 8	2014	Target ≥							54.00%	65.50%	73.00%	54.00%	82.00%	85.00%
			Data							26.70%	28.50%	29.80%	26.70%	28.33%	8.84%
	G HS	2014	Target ≥							48.60%	61.40%	79.00%	48.60%	86.00%	88.00%
			Data							31.00%	39.00%	38.90%	31.00%	47.56%	16.08%
Math	A Grade 3	2014	Target ≥						34.80%	40.60%	40.80%	72.00%	79.00%	83.00%	
			Data							53.00%	65.00%	69.00%	39.40%	39.43%	19.51%
	B Grade 4	2014	Target ≥							29.80%	35.10%	34.70%	70.00%	77.00%	81.00%
			Data							50.00%	63.00%	66.00%	33.00%	30.62%	16.70%
	C Grade 5	2014	Target ≥							44.00%	58.00%	64.00%	68.00%	76.00%	80.00%
			Data							24.00%	29.80%	28.90%	28.70%	27.87%	14.60%
	D Grade 6	2014	Target ≥							19.00%	22.90%	24.40%	68.00%	74.00%	78.00%
			Data							43.00%	57.00%	61.00%	28.70%	24.08%	10.03%
	E Grade 7	2014	Target ≥							17.90%	23.40%	23.30%	67.00%	75.00%	79.00%
			Data							44.00%	58.00%	63.00%	24.80%	24.39%	9.56%
	F Grade 8	2014	Target ≥							18.00%	17.90%	19.10%	61.00%	71.00%	76.00%
			Data							44.00%	58.00%	56.00%	19.90%	20.68%	9.44%
	G HS	2014	Target ≥							16.90%	21.00%	19.40%	67.00%	75.00%	79.00%
			Data							48.00%	61.00%	63.00%	19.50%	21.31%	9.29%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Grade 3	Target ≥	90.00%
		Data	18.98%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	89.00%
		Data	18.49%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	91.00%
		Data	15.43%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	92.00%
		Data	11.42%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	92.00%
		Data	12.87%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	88.00%
		Data	9.07%

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Group Name		FFY	2015
	G HS	Target ≥	91.00%
		Data	4.25%
Math	A Grade 3	Target ≥	86.00%
		Data	24.05%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	85.00%
		Data	19.35%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	84.00%
		Data	17.72%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	83.00%
		Data	13.09%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	84.00%
		Data	11.13%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	80.00%
		Data	11.35%
	G HS	Target ≥	84.00%
		Data	3.60%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	93.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	91.00%	94.00%	97.00%
	G ≥ HS	93.00%	95.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	90.00%	93.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	89.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	87.00%	91.00%	96.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	11749	11873	11575	10820	9864	9401	n	n	556	n	7255
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1300	1319	908	635	516	329					329
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	409	543	387	309	283	161					92
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	288	301	320	249	319	286			241		

**Data Source:** SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	11848	11943	11625	10893	9922	9460	n	n	583	n	6877
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1517	1318	1075	658	386	373					425
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	741	646	594	384	194	181					82
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	364	343	378	299	356	367			245		

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Grade 3	11,749	1,997	18.98%	92.00%	17.00%
B Grade 4	11,873	2,163	18.49%	92.00%	18.22%
C Grade 5	11,575	1,615	15.43%	93.00%	13.95%
D Grade 6	10,820	1,193	11.42%	94.00%	11.03%
E Grade 7	9,864	1,118	12.87%	94.00%	11.33%
F Grade 8	9,401	776	9.07%	91.00%	8.25%
G HS	7,255	421	4.25%	93.00%	5.80%

### Reasons for Group A Slippage

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have been aligned to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in reading proficiency rates.

**Reasons for Group C Slippage**

The Arizona ELA Standards were under review during the first half of the 2016–2017 school year, and their final approval wasn't reached until December 2016. Therefore, Arizona's state assessment, the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have been aligned to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in reading proficiency rates.

**Reasons for Group E Slippage**

The Arizona ELA Standards were under review during the first half of the 2016–2017 school year, and their final approval wasn't reached until December 2016. Therefore, Arizona's state assessment, the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have been aligned to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in reading proficiency rates.

**Reasons for Group F Slippage**

The Arizona ELA Standards were under review during the first half of the 2016–2017 school year, and their final approval wasn't reached until December 2016. Therefore, Arizona's state assessment, the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have been aligned to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in reading proficiency rates.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Grade 3	11,848	2,622	24.05%	90.00%	22.13%
B Grade 4	11,943	2,307	19.35%	89.00%	19.32%
C Grade 5	11,625	2,047	17.72%	88.00%	17.61%
D Grade 6	10,893	1,341	13.09%	87.00%	12.31%
E Grade 7	9,922	936	11.13%	88.00%	9.43%
F Grade 8	9,460	921	11.35%	85.00%	9.74%
G HS	6,877	507	3.60%	88.00%	7.37%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

The Arizona Mathematics Standards were under review during the first half of the 2016–2017 school year, and their final approval wasn't reached until December 2016. Therefore, Arizona's state assessment, the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have aligned itself to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year, there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in math proficiency rates.

**Reasons for Group E Slippage**

The Arizona Mathematics Standards were under review during the first half of the 2016–2017 school year, and their final approval wasn't reached until December 2016. Therefore, Arizona's state assessment, the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have aligned itself to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year, there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in math proficiency rates.

**Reasons for Group F Slippage**

The Arizona Mathematics Standards were under review during the first half of the 2016–2017 school year, and their final approval wasn't reached until December 2016. Therefore, Arizona's state assessment, the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), couldn't have aligned itself to a single set of standards with integrity, as over the course of the school year, there was more than one set of standards with which to align. This temporary, unavoidable misalignment may have contributed to the slight slippage in math proficiency rates.

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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

The FFY 2016 Annual Performance Report (APR) gives information about the participation of students with IEPs. The APR is located on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/> under the list titled Annual Performance Report.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

The FFY 2015 and FFY 2016 public reporting of statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR 300.160(f) can be found at the following Web link:

<http://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/data-management/>.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.55%	1.50%	1.40%	1.35%	1.30%	1.25%	1.20%	0%	0%
Data		2.30%	1.87%	0.18%	0.18%	0.51%	0.34%	0%	0.30%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	0%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other communications became available after the close of the 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 responds to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considers the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

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

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 418

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
1	217	0%	0%	0.46%

**Reasons for Slippage**

The slippage was a result of an adjustment in the definition of the denominator. Although the determined n-size (50) has remained constant, in prior years the denominator used in determining significant discrepancy was the total number of LEAs in the state. The requirement effective for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR was that if a minimum n-size had been established, the denominator must exclude PEAs that fail to meet that n-size. This adjustment in the definition resulted in a lower denominator, which resulted in a higher reported percentage of significant discrepancy.

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

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
 State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona uses Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to calculate rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs. Arizona uses the State Bar method to determine significant discrepancy. The State rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with IEPs is 0.37%. The State Bar, 5.37%, is five percentage points greater than the State rate.

A district or charter school has significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with IEPs is 5.37% or greater. There must be at least 50 students in the denominator of a suspension/expulsion rate for a district or charter school to be flagged as having significant discrepancy. The denominator represents the overall special education enrollment at the district or charter school.

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

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

The 2015–2016 data were reported by the PEAs through the Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as the data reported under section 618, Table 5 (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for the school year 2015–2016, which was submitted on October 26, 2016. The October 1, 2015, child count data are the same as the State's data reported under section 618, Table 1, Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Note that the source of this data is from FFY 2015. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year because the number of charter schools that may open and close from year to year varies.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State reviewed the PEAs' suspension/expulsion data by race or ethnicity and identified **no** PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. In the event that a PEA had been identified as having significant discrepancy, the PEA would have reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to determine if these contributed to the significant discrepancy.

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

The PEA then would have reviewed its practices via a self-assessment, and specifically conducted an assessment of the PEA's discipline practices—a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State's monitoring forms. ADE/ESS specialists would have conducted on-site visits and/or desk audits during the self-assessment to validate the decisions made by the PEA during the file reviews.

Upon completion of these reviews, Arizona would have then determined whether or not the PEA was in compliance with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0.17%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 467

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	168	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Arizona uses Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to calculate rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs. Arizona uses the State Bar method to determine significant discrepancy. The State rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with IEPs is 0.37%. The State Bar, 5.37%, is five percentage points greater than the State rate.

A district or charter school has significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with IEPs is 5.37% or greater. There must be at least 50 students in the denominator of a suspension/expulsion rate for a district or charter school to be flagged as having significant discrepancy. The denominator represents the overall special education enrollment at the district or charter school for a given race/ethnicity.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The 2015–2016 data were reported by the PEAs through the Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as the data reported under section 618, Table 5 (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for the school year 2015–2016, which was submitted on October 26, 2016. The October 1, 2015, child count data are the same as the State's data reported under section 618, Table 1, Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Note that the source of this data is from FFY 2015. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year because the number of charter schools that may open and close from year to year varies.

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State reviewed the PEAs' suspension/expulsion data by race or ethnicity and identified **no** PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. In the event that a PEA had been identified as having significant discrepancy, the PEA would have reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to determine if these contributed to the significant discrepancy.

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

The PEA then would have reviewed its practices via a self-assessment, and specifically conducted an assessment of the PEA's discipline practices—a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State's monitoring forms. ADE/ESS specialists would have conducted on-site visits and/or desk audits during the self-assessment to validate the decisions made by the PEA during the file reviews.

Upon completion of these reviews, Arizona would have then determined whether or not the PEA was in compliance with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

### OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	63.00%	63.50%
		Data		50.50%	52.30%	55.00%	56.70%	58.60%	60.00%	60.40%	62.00%	62.93%	63.65%
B	2005	Target ≤			16.50%	16.00%	15.50%	15.00%	14.50%	14.00%	13.50%	15.00%	15.00%
		Data		17.20%	16.20%	15.00%	14.90%	14.60%	14.80%	14.68%	15.00%	15.06%	14.75%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.50%	2.30%	2.10%	1.90%	1.70%	1.50%	1.30%	2.00%	2.00%
		Data		2.60%	2.70%	2.50%	2.70%	2.65%	2.60%	2.80%	2.00%	1.92%	2.06%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	64.00%
	Data	64.94%
B	Target ≤	15.00%
	Data	14.76%
C	Target ≤	2.00%
	Data	2.11%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%
Target B ≤	14.90%	14.70%	14.50%
Target C ≤	2.00%	2.00%	1.90%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requests input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Additionally, the ADE/ESS data management coordinator trains data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requests input for improving the State's data collection and reporting process.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	119,695	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	78,707	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	17,641	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	1,996	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	87	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	300	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	78,707	119,695	64.94%	64.50%	65.76%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,641	119,695	14.76%	14.90%	14.74%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,383	119,695	2.11%	2.00%	1.99%

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									48.50%	50.00%	50.00%
		Data								48.01%	49.80%	52.15%	51.82%
B	2011	Target ≤									45.50%	44.80%	44.80%
		Data								46.11%	44.81%	41.41%	41.95%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	50.50%
	Data	51.36%
B	Target ≤	44.60%
	Data	42.36%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%
Target B ≤	44.40%	44.20%	44.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requests input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Additionally, the ADE/ESS data management coordinator trains data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requests input for improving the State's data collection and reporting process.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	15,555	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program</a>	7,989	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	6,504	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	63	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
 FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,989	15,555	51.36%	51.00%	51.36%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,567	15,555	42.36%	44.40%	42.22%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2011	Target ≥						75.88%	76.38%		72.20%	80.00%	80.00%
		Data					75.88%	81.39%	79.76%	71.70%	79.90%	78.85%	78.74%
A2	2011	Target ≥						59.30%	59.80%		58.80%	63.30%	63.30%
		Data					59.30%	70.13%	69.98%	58.30%	63.30%	61.98%	60.07%
B1	2011	Target ≥						68.47%	68.97%		75.00%	79.00%	79.00%
		Data					68.47%	82.02%	72.60%	74.50%	79.00%	77.44%	77.68%
B2	2011	Target ≥						47.36%	47.86%		57.90%	62.00%	62.00%
		Data					47.36%	69.76%	60.41%	57.40%	62.00%	60.53%	59.32%
C1	2011	Target ≥						76.95%	77.45%		71.90%	76.20%	76.20%
		Data					76.95%	75.54%	80.16%	71.40%	76.20%	78.22%	74.35%
C2	2011	Target ≥						57.50%	57.90%		63.20%	67.00%	67.00%
		Data					57.50%	61.85%	69.74%	62.70%	67.00%	64.12%	63.33%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	80.50%
	Data	78.66%
A2	Target ≥	63.50%
	Data	58.59%
B1	Target ≥	79.50%
	Data	79.21%
B2	Target ≥	62.50%
	Data	59.07%
C1	Target ≥	76.50%
	Data	70.68%
C2	Target ≥	67.50%
	Data	60.07%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%
Target A2 ≥	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
Target B1 ≥	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%
Target B2 ≥	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%
Target C1 ≥	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%
Target C2 ≥	68.00%	68.50%	69.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016-2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

In addition to the SEAP's suggestions, ESS requests input from special education administrators through meetings of the regional organizations, small workshops, and large conferences. Additionally, the ADE/ESS data management coordinator trains data managers and administrators on the data requirements and also requests input for improving the State's data collection and reporting process.

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3401.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	160.00	4.70%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	414.00	12.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	776.00	22.82%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1384.00	40.69%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	667.00	19.61%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2160.00	2734.00	78.66%	81.00%	79.01%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2051.00	3401.00	58.59%	64.00%	60.31%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	171.00	5.03%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	431.00	12.67%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	780.00	22.93%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1425.00	41.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	594.00	17.47%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2205.00	2807.00	79.21%	80.00%	78.55%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2019.00	3401.00	59.07%	63.00%	59.36%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	169.00	4.97%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	211.00	6.20%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	271.00	7.97%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1132.00	33.28%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1618.00	47.57%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1403.00	1783.00	70.68%	77.00%	78.69%

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2750.00	3401.00	60.07%	68.00%	80.86%

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years?** Yes

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** No  
**Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

Arizona uses the Widely Held Expectations report contained in Teaching Strategies GOLD. This instrument uses a uniform scale that presents scores for each area of development and learning. Using these scaled scores enables teachers to compare groups of children’s scores across areas to determine which areas need additional attention and allows them to better understand each child as a whole.

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

The Widely Held Expectations tool report contained in Teaching Strategies GOLD assesses children in the areas of social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and mathematics as they relate to the requisite OSEP indicators. Expectations are defined as age ranges for children’s development and learning. While typical progressions are presented for most objectives, they are not rigid requirements, and a range of scores exists for each area and age group.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	50.00%	60.00%	65.00%	55.00%	57.00%
Data		44.90%	48.20%	90.00%	88.00%	85.00%	57.00%	60.40%	55.00%	60.20%	85.51%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	59.00%
Data	92.05%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In early 2015, Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Exceptional Student Services (ESS) developed and field-tested a nine-question survey with eight Likert-scaled questions and one open-ended question. ADE Research and Evaluation and ESS staff, along with Raising Special Kids staff (Arizona's Parent Training and Information Center), designed the survey and consulted statewide with special education directors and families for consensus to use the nine questions in the 2014–2015 field-test. The field-tested survey was determined by ADE statisticians to be valid and reliable following an exhaustive analysis of parent responses.

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on parent involvement to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's policy advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, and charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS personnel respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice in determining targets for the SPP.

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

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
10407.00	12212.00	92.05%	61.00%	85.22%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	9.03%	135250.00
---	-------	-----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

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

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

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

**Valid and Reliable Data**

ADE Exceptional Student Services ensures that the Indicator 8 parent involvement survey data are valid and reliable. Every public education agency (PEA) special education director was provided with detailed survey instructions and sample parent instruction letters to involve all parents who have a child with a disability (preschool through high school). The Parent Involvement Survey Coordinator offered PEA staff extensive, ongoing technical assistance to maximize parental responses and involvement rates.

Data analysis of respondents’ self-reported race / ethnicity and child age confirmed results are representative of the state special education population.

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

Race/Ethnicity of Child of Parent Respondent	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Special Education Population (Child Count)	Percentage of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Hispanic/Latino of Any Race	4,322	33.76%	60,612	44.81%
American Indian or Alaska Native	912	7.12%	8,176	6.05%
Asian	185	1.44%	1,844	1.36%
Black or African-American	589	4.60%	8,449	6.25%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	53	.41%	364	0.27%
White	5,781	45.15%	51,972	38.43%
Two or More Races	961	7.51%	3,833	2.83%
Total	12803		135,250	

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

The response rates for American Indian or Alaska Native (7.12%), Black/African-American (4.60%) and Hispanic parents (33.76%) are lower than the State special education population data of 6.08%, 6.32%, % and 44.41 %, respectively. It is possible that the responses in the multi-racial category (race/ethnicity was self-reported) and the responses that did not report ethnicity (which combined would account for 7.64% of the responses) may have been reported differently when other data-collection methods were used. Some of these variances in race/ethnicity responses may be affecting the percentage of American Indian or Alaska Native, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino participation. It should be noted that the percentage of respondents who selected the two or more races is significantly higher than the State race/ethnicity statistics for that group.

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

Child Age Group	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Special Education Population (Child Count)	Percentage of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Ages 3–5	1,339	10.46 %	15,555	11.50%
Ages 6–13	7,798	60.91 %	79,427	58.73%
Ages 14–22	3,666	28.63 %	40,268	29.77%
Total	12,803		135,250	

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 414

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	225	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation**

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

**Methodology**

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

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

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

**Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures**

On an annual basis, Arizona requires all PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.11, §300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. Each year, if the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

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

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

**Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices**

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

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

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

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

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of n the first year, then ESS program specialist:
  - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable, and
  - Validates the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the PEA is required to:
  - Review current monitoring data, if applicable;
  - Review the prior year's self-assessment and describe the issues identified;
  - Describe the steps taken to resolve those issues;
  - Describe any current concerns regarding possible inappropriate identification;
  - Describe the resources and technical assistance used to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and
  - Review individual student files using the State's monitoring forms:
    - The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the file reviews to validate the decisions made by the PEAs.
    - The ESS specialists verify correction of instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific, through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
    - The ESS specialists ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.80%	2.40%	0.35%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 492

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	0	147	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation**

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

**Methodology**

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

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in

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

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

### **Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures**

On an annual basis, Arizona requires all PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.11, §§300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. Each year, if the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

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

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

### **Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices**

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

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

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

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

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of n the first year, then ESS program specialist:
  - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable, and
  - Validates the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the PEA is required to:
  - Review current monitoring data, if applicable;
  - Review the prior year's self-assessment and describe the issues identified;
  - Describe the steps taken to resolve those issues;
  - Describe any current concerns regarding possible inappropriate identification;
  - Describe the resources and technical assistance used to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and
  - Review individual student files using the State's monitoring forms:
    - The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the file reviews to validate the decisions made by the PEAs.
    - The ESS specialists verify correction of instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific, through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
    - The ESS specialists ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.00%	84.00%	89.00%	92.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	98.24%	99.60%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.82%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
205	194	99.82%	100%	94.63%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	11
---	----

**Reasons for Slippage**

For FFY 2016, Arizona changed its monitoring system data collection method from a sampling of all PEAs—as collected in FFY 2015—to select PEAs based on the results of a review of the PEAs' data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. This adjustment to the data collection method resulted in a sharp decrease in the number of files reviewed, and this decrease likely contributed to the slippage in this indicator.

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

**FFY 2016 Noncompliance**

Number of findings by incidents of noncompliance	Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/26/18
11	11

**Range of Days beyond the Timeline**

Range of Days 2-117  
 Mean 25.7  
 Median 17  
 Mode N/A

Reasons for the delays included unavailability of required personnel (parent, general education teacher, etc.) and lack of understanding of the evaluation process. The reason for the longest delay (117 days) was lack of understanding of the evaluation process.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

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

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

### Data Source

The data for Indicator 11 are from the Arizona monitoring system. During FFY 2015, the monitoring system collected data from all PEAs that conducted an initial evaluation. However, beginning in FFY 2016, the monitoring system changed to include only select public education agencies (PEAs)—those chosen based on the results of a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. Hence, both the reported (a) number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received and (b) number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days sharply decreased for FFY 2016.

### Data Collection

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

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

The data that Arizona collects and reports for this Indicator include all children whose permissions to evaluate were received during FFY 2015 and for whom initial evaluations including eligibility determinations were completed during either FFY 2015 or FFY 2016.

### Valid and Reliable Data

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

### Evaluation Timeline

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

### Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2016

During FFY 2016, a finding for Indicator 11 was issued when the line item for the evaluation timeline was found to be noncompliant. The finding was a written notification to the PEA by the State that the line item was noncompliant, and the finding included a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. The source of information on which to base a finding of noncompliance was an individual student file.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

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

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

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		63.61%	82.40%	98.00%	93.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.15%	99.57%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.08%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,779
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	414
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,248
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	91
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	5
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	2,248	2,269	99.08%	100%	99.07%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	21
--	----

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

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

- Late referral from part C: 18
- Interruption of school schedule: 1
- Shortage of personnel: 1
- Did not pass Vision/hearing: 1

In FFY 2016, 21 children were not transitioned on time due to late referrals from from the Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) as compared with 20 in FFY 2015, 9 in FFY 2014, 11 in FFY 2013, 9 in FFY 2012, 21 in FFY 2011, and 39 in FFY 2010. School districts are asked to submit an alert to the ADE Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) any time they receive a late referral from AzEIP that was not in category d (parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services) or category e (children who were

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays). Each late referral from AzEIP to a district is reported to the State AzEIP office. The State AzEIP office provides technical assistance and follow-up to the local service-providing agency.

Similarly, if a local service-providing agency is reporting difficulty with a school district, the local agency issues an alert to the State AzEIP office. The ADE/ECSE provides technical assistance and follow-up to the school district. The ADE/ECSE and AzEIP maintain a shared database to track resolution of the difficulties indicated on the alerts. Challenges with the completion of hearing and vision screenings and the resulting time required for follow-ups are an inherent part of evaluating young children; these challenges at times cause delays in transition. Arizona has worked diligently to provide resources and facilitate collaborative efforts between Head Start organizations, school districts, and Part C agencies. This has helped Part C service coordinators encourage families to have regular hearing screenings.

**Range of Days Beyond Third Birthday**

Range of Days 4-158.\*

\*The 158 days beyond the child's third birthday was due to a late referral from Part C.

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

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

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

**Data Source**

The data for Indicator 12 are reported annually by all public education agencies (PEAs) in Arizona that have children who transition from Part C to Part B. Data are included for the entire reporting year, from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

**Data Collection**

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

**Valid and Reliable Data**

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE)/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) unit assures the validity and reliability of the data as it is collected, maintained, and reported using internal edit checks. Training is provided to school personnel by the ESS Data Management Unit regarding the operation of the data system and interpretation of the questions that are components of the measurement. The State requires an assurance from the PEAs through the submission of a signed form attesting to the validity of the data. Random verification checks require that a selected district submit a copy of the front page of the IEP that shows the date of the IEP and the child's birthday for children that transitioned from early intervention service or a prior written notice (PWN) of children found ineligible by the child's third birthday.

**Definition of Finding**

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

**FFY 2016 Noncompliance**

# findings of noncompliance	# of findings corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 8/01/2017
5	5

Arizona made 5 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, all 5 findings have been corrected as of August 1, 2017.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As specified in OSEP's June 2017 FFY 2015 SPP/APR Response, Arizona verified that each PEA with noncompliance reflected in the data:

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

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

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

- The ADE/ECSE specialists reviewed the written process and procedures for the PEAs' early intervention transitions, including those that were collaboratively developed and agreed upon with AzEIP service coordinators.
- The ADE/ECSE specialists reviewed student data during subsequent visits and/or desk audits of updated data to determine if the PEAs corrected all instances of noncompliance, including child-specific instances, and to ensure ongoing sustainability with the implementation of the regulatory requirements.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						90.00%	89.20%	78.00%	80.00%	89.51%	89.38%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.39%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
238	278	97.39%	100%	85.61%

**Reasons for Slippage**

For FFY 2016, Arizona changed its monitoring system data collection method from a sampling of all PEAs—as collected in FFY 2015—to select PEAs based on the results of a review of the PEAs' data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. This adjustment to the data collection method resulted in a sharp decrease in the number of files reviewed, and this decrease likely contributed to the slippage in this indicator.

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

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

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

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance**

Number of findings by incidence of noncompliance	Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/29/18
40	11

Arizona made 40 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, 11 findings have been corrected as of January 29, 2018.

**Data Source**

The data for Indicator 13 are from the Arizona monitoring system. In FFY 2015, the monitoring system included all PEAs with youth with IEPs aged 16 and above. In FFY 2016, the monitoring system selected public education agencies (PEAs) for monitoring each fiscal year based on the results of a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. Hence, both the reported Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above and the number of youth aged 16 and

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition saw a sharp decrease for FFY 2016.

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

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

**Data Collection**

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

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

**Valid and Reliable Data**

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

**Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2016**

During FFY 2016, a finding for Indicator 13 was issued when the line item for secondary transition was found to be noncompliant. The finding was a written notification to the PEA by the State that the line item was noncompliant, and the finding included a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. The source of information on which to base a finding of noncompliance is an individual student file.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes  No

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
43	43	null	0

**FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥							14.05%		26.60%	26.60%	28.10%
		Data						13.80%	13.60%	26.10%	19.60%	22.43%	23.09%
B	2011	Target ≥							48.65%		60.20%	60.20%	62.20%
		Data						48.40%	46.50%	59.70%	49.80%	57.08%	58.74%
C	2011	Target ≥							71.10%		74.10%	74.10%	75.40%
		Data						70.60%	68.50%	73.60%	66.90%	72.52%	73.51%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	29.60%
	Data	22.36%
B	Target ≥	64.20%
	Data	61.34%
C	Target ≥	76.70%
	Data	74.98%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	31.10%	32.60%	34.10%
Target B ≥	66.20%	68.20%	70.20%
Target C ≥	78.00%	79.30%	80.60%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies.

During the information-sharing SEAP meeting, the ADE/ESS representatives responded to questions and comments from the SEAP members and considered the panel's advice in determining targets for the future. The specific tasks requested of the SEAP by the ADE/ESS were these: (1) consideration of baseline and trend data for each indicator and (2) assistance in determining appropriate targets for each indicator (where a target was required for the SPP).

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

# FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6971.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1589.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2841.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	596.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	388.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1589.00	6971.00	22.36%	31.10%	22.79%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4430.00	6971.00	61.34%	66.20%	63.55%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	5414.00	6971.00	74.98%	78.00%	77.66%

### Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### Data Source and Collection Methods

Beginning in FFY 2014, ADE/ESS changed from using a sampling method to a census method to collect post school outcome (PSO) data. This represented a significant change to the sampling method used by ADE/ESS since the inception of OSEP-mandated PSO reporting. ADE/ESS branded the census methodology, "Everyone Counts, Everyone In," to inform PEAs of the change and to facilitate the switch from a sampling to a census data collection methodology. PEAs were provided information on the state's rationale for the change, as well as training and marketing materials designed to assist PEAs that serve transition-aged youth in the collection of post school outcome data annually; this change allowed for better results-driven analysis and improvements to secondary transition programs at the state and local levels. OSEP was informed of this change.

During FFY 2016, 276 PEAs had leavers who met the criteria (youth with a current IEP who aged out, graduated, or dropped out) for participation in the PSO Survey. Of this number, 156 or 57% of PEAs that were required to participate in the PSO data collection had ten or fewer leavers while 20 or 7% of PEAs had 100 or more leavers. A total of 8,632 youth statewide were eligible to take the PSO Survey during the FFY16 data collection period. Of the 276 PEAs required to participate in the PSO Survey, 264 (96%) met the requirement.

In order for PEAs to communicate with students for the PSO Survey, PEAs gather contact information on student leavers so they can reach these leavers the next year. Schools either input the data into the online PSO data collection system or maintain student contact information locally for use the next year. The PSO data collection system uses a secure application as part of ADEConnect, a secure single sign-on identity management system. The application includes an auto-population of student demographic information and exit reason imported from the Arizona Educational Data Standards (AzEDS), a Web-based system for reporting all student-level details to the ADE. PEAs designate district or charter school personnel to contact student leavers or designated family members (i.e., parents, grandparents, or guardians), conduct phone interviews, and input survey data into the online PSO data collection system. Youth or family members were contacted between June 1 and September 30, 2017, after they were out of school for at least one year.

### Missing Data

Arizona's PSO response rate for FFY 2016 was 81% (8,632 youth eligible for contact and 6,971 respondents). The FFY 2016 PSO Survey is missing data on 1,661 former students or 19% of the leavers. An analysis of missing data indicated that the largest segments of missing data were the result of four factors:

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

1. schools were not able to contact leavers after three attempts (929 former students or 56% of the missing data)
2. schools did not have correct contact information for leavers (497 former students or 29% of the missing data)
3. schools did not collect contact information for leavers (49 former students or 3% of the missing data)
4. the respondents refused to participate (140 former students or 8% of the missing data)

### Selection Bias

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

### Response Rate

The FFY 2016 survey response rate was 80.8%. Arizona's FFY 2016 census included 8,632 youth who were eligible to take the survey. (The total was adjusted for those who had returned to school or were deceased, or whose data were uploaded by the PEA to the SAIS system in error.) Interviews were conducted with 6,971 youth, young adults, or their family members or 80.8% of the leavers.

### Representativeness

The ADE/ESS used the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Center to calculate the representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of (a) disability type, (b) ethnicity, (c) gender, and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout). This calculation determined whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP exiting school during school year 2015–2016. According to the NPSO Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of +/- 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group, and positive differences indicate over-representativeness.

Respondents were representative of all 2015–2016 target leavers based on gender, ethnicity, graduation status, and category of disability. As in previous years, youth who dropped out of school were underrepresented compared to the target leaver group. In FFY 2016, a -4.8% difference between respondents and the target leavers group existed. This represents a 0.6% decrease over FFY 2015 in dropouts being underrepresented. ADE/ESS will continue its efforts to increase response rates, especially among youth who drop out. Technical assistance and information highlighting tips provided in the NPSO guidance document for contacting hard-to-reach youth is provided to PEAs during PSO trainings and is also posted on the ADE/ESS PSO website.

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			60.00%	63.00%	68.00%	70.00%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	65.22%	66.00%
Data		57.90%	72.70%	68.20%	83.90%	44.70%	55.88%	44.83%	48.39%	65.22%	52.38%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	66.00%
Data	59.09%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016-2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/Dispute Resolution staff reported on Section 618, Table 7: Dispute Resolution, under Part B of IDEA, to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/Dispute Resolution representatives frequently respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding Table 7 data.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	10	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	18	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
10	18	59.09%	65.00% - 75.00%	55.56%

**Reasons for Slippage**

In FFY 2015, 13 of 22 resolution sessions resulted in resolution agreements. In FFY 2016, 10 of 18 resolution sessions resulted in resolution agreements—a 3.53% decrease. However, with low denominators like 22 and 18, a 3.53% change is statistically irrelevant. While the decrease technically appears as slippage, the reduction in actual numbers is quite small and can be accounted for based on individual cases from year to year.

Additionally, during FFY 2016, 18 resolution sessions were held pursuant to due process hearing requests, with 10 matters (55.56%) resulting in resolution agreements. This reflects slippage from FFY 2015 (59.09%). Of the 18 resolution sessions held: 10 resulted in resolution agreements; one matter was pending a due process hearing as of June 30, 2017; one matter was withdrawn by the

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

complaining party; five complaints were dismissed by the administrative law judge; and one resulted in a settlement agreement outside of the resolution session process.

It is noteworthy that of the 76 due process complaints filed:

- 0 resulted in a fully adjudicated hearing;
- 19 were pending as of June 30, 2017;
- 10 were resolved through a formal resolution agreement;
- 11 were resolved via mediation agreement; and
- 57 were dismissed or withdrawn
  - Of the 57 that were withdrawn, 28 were due to resolutions achieved via private settlement

Thus, although Arizona did not meet its target of 65–75% on this indicator, of the 57 matters that were resolved without a hearing by or before June 30, 2017, 49 or 86% were resolved by resolution agreement, mediation agreement, or a private settlement. This indicates that although the percentage increased marginally, overall, the State’s due process system is successful in resolving due process complaints without the need for a fully adjudicated due process hearing.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			82.50%	83.00%	83.50%	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%	72.22%	74.00%
Data		82.00%	73.90%	70.80%	70.30%	85.71%	69.00%	82.86%	86.49%	72.22%	62.86%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	76.00%
Data	78.26%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2016–2017 school year, individuals from the ADE/Dispute Resolution staff reported on Section 618, Table 7: Dispute Resolution, under Part B of IDEA, to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/Dispute Resolution representatives frequently respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding Table 7 data.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	11	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	12	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	40	null

**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
11	12	40	78.26%	72.00% - 82.00%	57.50%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Arizona experienced slippage in FFY 2016 (57.50%) as compared to FFY 2015 (78.26%) and did not meet its target of 72–82% for FFY 2016. The slippage may be due to the increasingly complicated nature of the disputes and the increase in the use of mediation when both parties are represented by attorneys. Mediators report anecdotally that the parties to mediation are often able to successfully resolve substantive issues, but fail to sign a mediation agreement due to disagreement over the issue of attorney fees. Arizona maintains a list of nine independent contractors to serve as mediators. The mediators are required to complete a 40-hour course in mediation, have 20 hours of hands-on mediation experience, and have a background in education. As part of their ongoing training, mediators must attend the ADE’s annual Directors’ Institute, which includes a full-day private training specifically tailored for state administrative complaint investigators, administrative law judges, and mediators.

Information about Arizona’s mediation system is disseminated to PEAs through trainings and conferences and upon request. Additionally, the director of Dispute Resolution works with the State’s Special Education Advisory Panel and the State’s Parent Training and Information Center (Raising Special Kids) to ensure that information on mediation is widely disseminated to parents.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2015

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		14.60%		8.60%
Data	14.20%	0.69%	6.40%	

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	10.80%	12.99%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Overview**

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

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

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

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

## FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Description

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

### Theory of Action

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

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

### Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

### Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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

**Selected:** Chief State School Officer

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

Name: Alissa Trollinger

Title: Deputy Associate Superintendent, Exceptional Student Services

Email: alissa.trollinger@azed.gov

Phone: 602-364-4004