

AZ
Part B

FFY2017
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

The Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) system of general supervision involves four main components: programmatic monitoring, dispute resolution, fiscal operations (including fiscal monitoring), and professional development/technical assistance. Programmatic monitoring assists public education agencies (PEAs) in implementing compliant special education programs that improve outcomes and provides support and technical assistance in order to improve student outcomes aligned to all OSEP indicators through annual site visit activities, monitoring activities, and review of risk analysis data. Dispute resolution allows for the community to notify the ADE/ESS that a PEA is or may be in noncompliance with the IDEA or a state special education requirement to identify and correct noncompliance. Fiscal operations administers IDEA entitlement funding and also conducts single audit accounting reviews to ensure items match submitted and approved budget/uses. Finally, professional development and technical assistance are provided by every IDEA-funded area, take many forms, and are responsive to PEA request and data generated through IDEA and other education metrics. Special education administration is a system at both the SEA and PEA levels, not a collection of separate and isolated functions.

Programmatic monitoring in Arizona is based on a six-year cycle that balances compliance and results-driven accountability (RDA) with a focus on outcomes for students with disabilities. Programmatic monitoring is structured around collaborative conversations and technical assistance (TA). All PEAs were involved in the following activities in the 2017-2018 school year:

- Technical assistance from ESS
- Review of data, including student files
- Collection of student exit data
- Collection of post-school outcomes
- Completion of Indicator 8 parent survey
- Collection of Indicators 11 and 13

In addition, some schools were involved in the following activities, depending on their cycle year:

- Review of policies and procedures
- Preparing for monitoring
- Conducting monitoring activities
- Completion of corrective actions

Activity	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Provide TA	x	x	x	x	x	x
Review PEA Data, Including Student Files	x	x	x	x	x	x
Review PEA Policies and Procedures	x			x		
PEA Collects Student Exit Form Data	x	x	x	x	x	x
PEA Collects Post-School Outcomes	x	x	x	x	x	x
PEA Completes Indicator 8 Parent Survey	x	x	x	x	x	x
Prepare for Monitoring			x			
Conduct Monitoring Activities				x		
Complete Corrective Actions					x	

During the 2017-2018 school year, ADE/ESS continued the implementation of its yearly review of data related to special education. Compliance and results indicator data, PEA determinations, and annual site visit data continue to be reviewed annually by assigned program specialists in collaboration with PEA directors. The system supports practices that improve educational results for students with disabilities by using multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance and by encouraging and supporting improvement through targeted TA and professional development.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
ffy 17 spp-apr ta.pdf	Connie Hargis	1/16/2019 9:06 AM	

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

The Arizona programmatic monitoring system was revised in FFY 2017 to bring into balance the focus on data for each PEA and the procedural compliance requirements. The programmatic monitoring system combines compliance and results in the review of PEA policies, procedures, and practices. Components of the six-year monitoring cycle include a yearly review of the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) compliance and results Indicators 1-14. Student file data are reviewed for every PEA each year.

The PSM specialist assigned to the school district or charter school will meet with the PEA director each spring to discuss PEA data and to plan for any upcoming monitoring activities when the PEA is scheduled for monitoring the following year. The Risk Analysis Tool used for data review is located in the Arizona Monitoring Manual.

Arizona has developed a six-year cycle for monitoring with assigned monitoring activities always occurring in Year 4 of the cycle. ESS can adjust a PEA's monitoring schedule at any time when systemic concerns arise during the review of data. PEAs that maintain exceptional data may have less intensive monitoring activities assigned as the data indicate they are meeting state targets. PEAs are required to comply with all requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) without regard to the assigned monitoring year or monitoring type.

There are three monitoring types: Data Review, Self-Assessment, and On-Site.

Data Review - determined by a score of more than one standard deviation above the state average on the risk analysis tool, and is assigned to PEAs whose data consistently reflect outstanding student outcomes and practices that support ongoing compliance with federal and state laws. PEAs in data review monitoring are required to review Indicators 11 and 13 as part of the collection of APR data.

Self-Assessment - determined by a score falling between one standard deviation above and/or below the state average score on the risk analysis tool, and is assigned to PEAs who show evidence of strong programs, but are inconsistent in a few areas in which data do not meet the state targets. PEAs in self-assessment monitoring are provided the opportunity to analyze issues in depth and find solutions for improvement and sustainability. Targeted review of student files include Indicators 11 and 13. PEAs in self-assessment monitoring will be targeted for participation in SSIP activities if they meet all of the following criteria: they service students in grades 3-5, they do not meet the state target in ELA proficiency, and they have a special education enrollment in grades 3-5 of ten or more students. If SSIP criteria do not apply, then PEAs will choose an area of focus in which they may not be meeting a state target. The PEA will complete activities that will result in the development of an action plan to address the area of focus.

On-Site - determined by a score of more than one standard deviation below the state average score on the risk analysis tool, and is assigned when a PEA shows evidence of broad issues of noncompliance. On-site monitoring includes a thorough review of procedural requirements along with a review of student performance data. PEAs participating in on-site monitoring will be targeted for participation in SSIP activities if they meet all of the following criteria: they service students in grades 3-5, they do not meet the state target in ELA proficiency, and they have a special education enrollment in grades 3-5 of ten or more students. If SSIP criteria do not apply, then PEAs will choose an area of focus in which they may not be meeting a state target. The PEA will complete activities that will result in the development of an action plan to address the area of focus. A PEA participating in an on-site monitoring is required to determine root causes of poor student performance as measured by the SPP/APR results indicators. Each outcome focus area analysis is driven by (but not restricted to) the ESS-provided analysis tool. The PEA and Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) team work together during the on-site monitoring. The PEA must have an agency team, including PEA employee(s) as active participants.

The procedural requirements of IDEA have been tied to the SPP/APR compliance and results indicators, and possible areas of focus are:

- Graduation
- Dropout
- Reading Proficiency
- Math Proficiency
- Secondary Transition
- Post-School Outcomes
- Suspension/Expulsion
- LRE - School Age
- Disproportionality
- Child Find - Initial Evaluation Timeline
- Family Engagement
- Special Education Population

For all assigned monitoring types, ongoing technical assistance plays a significant role in the general supervision of PEAs in Arizona. PSM specialists conduct annual visits with each assigned PEA to review a sample of the PEA's student files, including data related to Indicators 11, 12, and 13. When a PEA is not achieving 100% compliance on all three indicators, specialists give feedback and technical assistance. PSM specialists also provide ongoing TA related to any other issues and questions that may arise. Targeted training is provided when files and data indicate a need.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A "call" related to a PEA's compliance status is made for every line item in the monitoring. Line items are those monitoring items included on all forms in the monitoring manual. Each line item is composed of multiple components. Any one component within a line item that is found to be noncompliant generates a call of noncompliance for that line item. If multiple components within the line item are found to be noncompliant, a single "finding" for that line item will be generated (i.e., the line item will be found noncompliant), as opposed to a finding being generated for each single component.

At the conclusion of all monitoring activities, teams review data compiled into a report called the draft Summary of Findings (SOF). There are 17 possible findings in the ADE/ESS monitoring process. A finding occurs when a PEA is found to be less than 100% compliant for any line item. The formal notification of findings resulting from the monitoring (which starts the one-year corrective action timeline) is done in the form of a letter mailed no later than 30 days following the completion of all monitoring activities. The citation related to the area of noncompliance, along with a description of the qualitative and/or quantitative data, is included in the notification.

A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is developed by the PEA with guidance from the ESS team to address the correction of findings of noncompliance. The development of a CAP, which includes activities for improvement, is required for all line items that are less than 90% compliant. For those line items that are 90%-99% compliant, corrective action activities are not required; however, individual student-specific files involved require correction, and subsequent file reviews will occur during the corrective action year (Year 5) to ensure that 100% compliance and sustainability have been achieved for all items that were noncompliant.

Corrective action is not complete, and the monitoring cannot be closed, until all findings are verified as corrected in accordance with the OSEP 09-02 Memo, including: 1) the correction of all individual instances of noncompliance, including student-specific noncompliance, and 2) verification that the PEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

While the correction of noncompliance is required for monitoring, an additional area of focus for ADE/ESS centers on program improvement. Throughout the monitoring activities, PEAs are expected to examine their processes and systems in order to focus on improving programs while also correcting instances of noncompliance. This examination by PEAs is subject to validation and verification by ADE/ESS.

Incentives, Sanctions, and Enforcement Actions

Incentives Monitoring incentives are earned when a PEA successfully completes the data review or self-assessment monitoring.

- **Data Review** - 100% compliance on Indicators 11 and 13 = Two paid registrations to either Directors' Institute or Transition Conference
- **Self-Assessment** - Successful completion or performance tasks with all supporting documentation compliant = One paid registration to either Directors' Institute or Transition Conference

Corrective Action incentives are earned when a PEA successfully completes and closes out its Corrective Action Plan (CAP) within one year:

CAP closed within one year = Congratulatory letter and certificate

CAP not closed within one year = Enforcement actions until compliance is achieved

Enforcement Actions*

If a PEA is unable to complete the CAP and correct all identified noncompliance within a year from the date of the Written Notification of Findings letter, one or more of the following enforcement actions will be taken, based upon the severity of the remaining noncompliance:

- ESS development of a prescribed CAP with required activities and timelines to address the continuing noncompliance
- Enforcement of CAP activities as outlined in the current agency CAP
- Review and revision of the current CAP to develop targeted activities that address the continuing noncompliance
- Special monitor selection
- Interruption of IDEA payments until adequate compliance is achieved: For charter schools not receiving IDEA funds, request for withholding of 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 attorney general for assistance in law enforcement

*PEAs are entitled to request a hearing if they wish to challenge the enforcement action(s).

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.

Although the spirit of the federal special education regulations is that parents and schools will arrive at consensus, sometimes conflict arises. ADE/Dispute Resolution offers options for parents and schools to address and resolve these special education conflicts. Mediation is a no cost, voluntary, problem-solving process rather than an adversarial process that allows parents and schools to

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

communicate directly with each other as they work with a trained mediator toward a mutually agreeable solution. A parent of a child with a disability or a public education agency may request mediation as a way to resolve disputes involving any matter that arises under the IDEA or its implementing regulations. [34 C.F.R. § 506(a)]

ADE/Dispute Resolution employs four State complaint investigators who work under the supervision of the Director of Dispute Resolution. Mediators are trained in mediation techniques and are knowledgeable about special education. The mediator is a neutral party to the dispute trained to encourage open communication amongst the parties, identify points of agreement, and facilitate resolution. Mediators remain unbiased and impartial and do not act as an advocate or a legal advisor for either the school or parent. Mediators are assigned on an individual basis.

The director assigns incoming complaints, monitors the investigation progress, and reviews and signs all Letters of Corrective Action. 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 recurrence of noncompliance and states what is considered sufficient documentation to ensure that noncompliance has been addressed and to minimize the effects of the violations. ADE/Dispute Resolution employs a Corrective Action Compliance Monitor (CACM) to collect the required documentation, monitor timelines, and provide technical assistance, as necessary. When both parties to a State administrative complaint agree that a mutually beneficial resolution can be reached without the need for a full investigation, the assigned complaint investigator may assist the parties in reaching an informal resolution. Although no formal resolution agreement is required, if the complaining party indicates that she or he is satisfied with the PEAs response to the complaint, the complaint investigator will issue a withdrawal letter.

If the complaining party changes his or her mind about informal resolution and wants the investigation to go forward, the individual may notify the Dispute Resolution office within five business days and the investigation will move forward. Beginning in August 2005, Arizona switched from a two-tiered due process system to a single-tiered system. Due process hearings are conducted on behalf of the ADE 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.

ESS Fiscal Monitoring

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

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

1. Review of financial reports provided by the sub recipient
2. Follow-up to ensure timely and appropriate actions by sub recipients 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 sub recipients with training and technical assistance

ADE's fiscal 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 expenditure documentation and that all expenditures are accounted for

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 IDEA Grant

3. Fixed Assets

- Fixed Assets: monitoring/audit includes a physical review of assets purchased using IDEA Grants funds (if applicable)

4. Grants Management & Internal Control

- Administrative and Financial Record keeping: monitoring/audit ensures there is a solid internal control system in place for maintaining documentation

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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 PEAs selected for review will experience a Stage One Desk Review. This level of review includes: comparison of the Grant Accounting Expenditures report to the Grant Completion Report filed for the fiscal year under review; review of Grants Management History
2. **Stage Two - Expanded Desk Review:** If the Grant Expenditure reports do not match the corresponding Grant Completion Report, or if the Risk Assessment indicated internal control weaknesses, the PEA is moved to a more comprehensive Stage Two Expanded Desk Review. This level of review includes: Policies and Procedures for accounting processes, cash management, procurement, asset and inventory management, payroll and employee certification management, and Time and Effort policies; documents for audit samples selected from the Grant Accounting Expenditure report(s)
3. **Stage Three - On-Site Fiscal Review:** A Stage Three Review may result if a Stage Two Expanded Desk Review indicates a PEA 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 TA. However, if the risk factors for a PEA indicate significant compliance concerns, the Monitoring Auditor may proceed directly to a Stage Three On-Site Fiscal Review. This level of review includes: completed ESS Audit Questionnaire detailing internal control procedures: Policies and Procedures for accounting processes, cash management, procurement, asset and inventory management, payroll and employee certification management, and Time and Effort policies; documents for audit samples selected from the grant accounting expenditure report(s).

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 PEA's 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 ADE/ESS technical assistance system involves providing information and guidance on promising practices in educating students with disabilities and also furnishing information and guidance on the IDEA and Arizona's regulations and policies. This assistance is provided by all IDEA-funded ADE areas and takes place in person during site visits, regional meetings, conferences, and other events. Electronic technical assistance is provided via email and through the consultant of the day (COD) telephone line. Technical assistance materials are found throughout the ADE/ESS Web sites: <http://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/>, including The Arizona Technical Assistance System (AZ-TAS) documents website: <http://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/az-tas-documents/>, as well as information found on the Promising Practices Web site: <http://www.azpromisingpractices.com/>.

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

Professional learning and technical assistance are provided by every IDEA-funded area within ADE. Activities take many forms and are both responsive to PEA request and to data generated through IDEA and other educational indicators. ADE/ESS houses two primary professional learning units, Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), and Special Projects, that each address sustained professional development activities in a variety of content areas. Professional learning is planned using high leverage practices and frequently incorporates the support of local and national experts.

The Arizona State Personnel Development Grant (AZSPDG)

SPDG Collaborative Coach Meetings- Aug. 15, 2017, Nov. 15, 2017, Feb. 6, 2018, May 15, 2018

Module 4: Formative Assessment- Sept. 6, 2017, Sept. 13, 2017, Sept. 15, 2017,

Module 5: Differentiated Instruction- Nov. 29, 2017, Dec. 1, 2017, Dec. 7, 2017, Dec. 18, 2017, Jan. 17, 2018, Jan. 19, 2018

Module 6: Literacy Connections- March 23, 2018, March 27, 2018, April 6, 2018, April 11, 2018, April 12, 2018, April 18, 2018, April 23, 2018

The ADE/ESS received a grant from the OSEP 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 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, formative assessment, differentiated instruction and evidence-based 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 2017-2018 school year, Modules 4-6 were delivered to leadership and staff in grades 4-8 from Parker Unified School District, Glendale Elementary School District, and Cartwright School District.

Arizona State Autism Project (AzSAP)

August 23-25, 2017

September 13-15, 2017

September 27-29, 2017

October 4-6, 2017

Each district participating in the project received five in-district coaching visits.

ADE/ESS 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 students with autism spectrum disorder. The STAR (Strategies for Teaching based on Autism Research) Program, developed by Arick, Loos, Falco, 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 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 levels.

The LINKs curriculum 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. They strive 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.

Directors' Institute

September 18-20, 2017- Phoenix, AZ

The Directors' Institute 2017: *Change, Challenge, Opportunity* represented the commitment of the ADE to work with the constituents of Arizona to create meaningful programs that help students with disabilities develop to their fullest potential, as legislative and fiscal changes are enacted. Arizona's annual Directors' Institute provided meaningful, timely, and relevant professional development for special education directors.

Summer Institute

Modules 1-3- July 11-14, 2017

Trainer of Trainings Institute

Modules 7-9- July 17-20, 2017

Modules 7-9 Webinar- August 30, 2017

Modules 7-9 TOT Coaching- October 25-27, 2017

Module 10- November 29-30, 2017

Module 10 TOT- January 31-February 1, 2018

Modules 10 Coaching- February 22-23, 2018

The ADE offered school personnel a LETRS Summer Institute with content from LETRS Module 1- "The Challenge of Learning to Read," Module 2- "The Speech Sounds of English: Phonetics, Phonology, and Phoneme Awareness," and Module 3- "Spellography for Teachers: How English Spelling Works."

The Trainer of Trainings Institute dates represent the final year of LETRS Cohort 3 coordinated by the ADE. LETRS training is an opportunity for intensive professional development that increases teacher knowledge of literacy through the Trainer 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. Participants were provided with comprehensive and practical knowledge of how children learn to read, write, and spell, and are expected to deliver trainings at their school sites upon successful completion of each module assessment. Teachers and administrators use the knowledge acquired to improve instruction and implement evidence-based literacy interventions.

Multi-Tier Behavior Supports (MTBS)

Year1- Sept. 28-29, 2017, Dec. 7-8, 2017, Feb. 22-23, 2018

Year 2- Sept. 14-15, 2017, Nov. 2-3, 2017, Jan. 11-12, 2018, Feb. 8-9, 2018

Year 3- Sept. 7-8, 2017, Nov. 16-17, 2017, Jan. 25-26, 2018, March 1-2, 2018

MTBS Coaches- Nov. 6, 2017 (Year 3 coaches), Dec. 14-15, 2017 (Year 2 coaches), Jan. 18-19, 2018 (Year 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 Behavior Intervention 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.

Multi-Tier Behavior Supports (MTBS) Overview

August 14, 2017 Hasan Prep Tucson

August 23, 2017 Holbrook Unified District

MTBS Overview Training is offered to schools in the exploration phase of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) implementation. The training provides an overview of Tier 1 of PBIS, the role of staff voice, and the commitment and requirements of staff school-wide when undertaking a system change like PBIS. The training includes activities that helps staff reflect on their personal discipline philosophy, and it provides research that identifies the benefits of PBIS implementation.

July 12, 2017 CPLC Schools Tucson

August 15, 2017 Florence Unified School District

A booster session of Tier 1 was offered to school teams in Year 2 or 3 of the MTBS training project that had 50% or more of their team leave the school at the end of the previous year. It was provided to prevent a reduction in Tier 1 implementation.

School Resource Officer Training

October 31, 2017

November 14, 2017

January 23, 2018

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

Specialized PEA and Regional Trainings:

Autism and Behavior- 2/13/18 Bagdad School District

Low Incidence Disabilities and Severe Behavior- 2/21/18 Avondale School District

The Specialized PEA and Regional Trainings focus on the use of evidence-based practices so that educational staff can help determine supports and interventions to improve outcomes for any students, including students with severe disabilities. The trainings are developed based on the individual needs of the PEA.

SWIS (School-Wide Information System) Training

July 28, 2017- Tucson Unified District (SWIS)

August 4, 2017- Avondale Elementary District (SWIS)

August 10, 2017- Parker Unified District (CICO-SWIS)

August 16, 2017- Glendale Elementary District (CICO-SWIS)

August 31, 2017- Maricopa Unified District (6 schools) (SWIS)

September 6, 2017- Florence Unified District (3 schools) (SWIS)

September 19, 2017- Avondale Elementary District (SWIS)

September 25, 2017- Buckeye Elementary District (6 schools) (I-SWIS)

September 21, 2017- Buckeye Elementary District (I-SWIS)

September 27, 2017- Paradise Valley Unified School District (SWIS)

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

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

July 27, 2017- Bullhead Schools

September 1, 2017- Bullhead Schools

September 6, 2017- Sunnyside School District

September 13, 2017- Heritage Elementary Schools Charter

October 4, 2017- Sunnyside School District

October 6, 2017- Tucson Unified School District

November 1, 2017- Sunnyside School District

November 3, 2017- Bullhead Schools

December 6, 2017- Sunnyside School District

January 10, 2018- Sunnyside School District

January 20, 2018- Educator's Appreciation Day Conference

January 24, 2018- St. David School District

February 7, 2018- Sunnyside School District

February 28, 2018- St. David School District

March 7, 2018- Sunnyside School District

April 4, 2018- Sunnyside School District

April 25, 2018- UDL-IRN International Summit Pre-Conference

May 2, 2018- Sunnyside School District

The UDL and DI trainings focus on the best research-based techniques teachers can employ to help any struggling student, and particularly those with disabilities, become successful in mathematics at their grade level. The training teaches best practices for DI and UDL by incorporating manipulatives, utilizing engaging apps, and modifying curriculum in intentional ways to align with IEP goals. More specifically, participants are provided with examples of these research-based instructional practices and activities aligned to key target standards at multiple grade levels. The goal is 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.

Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Training

TBI 101- September 15, 2017- Central AZ

TBI 101- October 21, 2017- Southern AZ

TBI 202- October 26, 2017- Southern AZ

TBI 202- November 18, 2017- Central AZ

TBI 303- October 14, 2017- Central AZ

TBI 100- January 10, 2018- Secure Care

TBI 303- January 20, 2018- Southern AZ

TBI 404- February 10, 2018- Central AZ

TBI 101- February 21, 2018- Secure Care

TBI 505- April 21, 2018- Southern AZ

TBI Summer Trainer of Trainers June 6-8, 2018- Northern AZ

The TBI training educates local professionals on the core issues related to TBI including incidence, prevalence, injury mechanisms, impacts, “red flags” of previous injury, and differences among congenital injuries, non-traumatic injuries, and various cognitive disabilities. The training serves to increase awareness of the need to identify students with TBI in schools using uniform screening procedures and to increase the capacity of professionals to assess, accurately determine eligibility, and provide appropriate services for students with TBI and acquired brain injuries. Participants in the training learn how to more effectively participate in Child Study Team and Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team meetings and analyze assessment data to appropriately plan for in-class accommodations, modifications, and intervention strategies. They also increase their knowledge about cognitive and behavioral interventions after a brain injury and expand their knowledge of existing resources.

Secondary Transition: Regional Training

During the 2017-2018 school year, Secondary Transition specialists provided a 2-day training series and reached stakeholders in all Arizona counties. Topics for the training consisted of:

Day 1

Assessments & Accommodations - a full-day training that looks closely at age-appropriate transition assessments and the process of collecting and using the data to make informed decisions for realistic and attainable postsecondary goals. Accommodations and strategies for successful inclusion and integration into competitive employment and community activities were explored. Day 1 included a very brief review of compliance requirements.

Day 2

Transition Planning Process – Putting It All Together - a full-day training to learn the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) transition planning process and participate in a workshop writing a secondary IEP for postsecondary transition. Participants learned best practices for documentation and how to implement the strategies and resources learned on Day 1 to create meaningful transition plans. Participants also created transition plans and reviewed for relevance.

Stakeholders included public school special and general education teachers, administrators, and local agency representatives that provide transition services such as Vocational Rehabilitation (VR), mental health services, and the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD).

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

During the 2017-2018 school year, training was provided for those who oversee or administer the PSO Survey. The PSO Survey, conducted one year after students exit high school, is required to be completed by districts and charter schools who serve students with disabilities ages 16 and over each year between June 1 and September 30. Training included the requirements for the PSO Survey and how to incorporate suggested tips and techniques to ensure the data collection was valid and accurate and that results obtained were useful. Training was conducted via webinar, individual phone conference, and in person.

Secondary Transition: 2017 Transition Conference:

Arizona’s Seventeenth Annual Transition Conference, was held at the Talking Stick Resort in Scottsdale, Arizona. This unique conference brought together over 900 participants comprised of students with disabilities, their families, school-level

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

providers, and outside agencies who provide support to families and schools. The 2017 conference was especially exciting as the ADE offered more than 150 scholarships to students and family members through a partnership with the Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs (OCSHCN).

The event provided professional development aimed at increasing post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. Session strands were focused on students with disabilities, their families and caregivers, and professionals working in schools or agencies. National and local presenters brought their expertise to the over 90 sessions offered over three days, and keynote addresses focused on self-advocacy and building support systems for students with disabilities.

This conference utilized the efforts of the Transition Planning Committee, which includes ADE, RSA/VR, the DDD, the OCSHCN, Raising Special Kids, and PEA stakeholders. The annual Transition Conference is traditionally the largest conference that the ADE/ESS hosts, and it reaches capacity within two weeks of registration opening.

Achieving Success by Promoting Readiness for Education and Employment (ASPIRE)

During the 2016-17 school year, ASPIRE staff provided ½-day trainings in rural counties in Arizona. Topics for the trainings consisted of an introduction to ASPIRE-related services, parent resources, benefits planning, and self-determination for youth and youth employment. Stakeholders included ASPIRE youth, parents, and family members.

Additionally, ASPIRE staff provided workshops in urban communities. Topics for the training consisted of ASPIRE-related services, specifically focusing on youth self-determination and engagement. Stakeholders included youth and their guardians.

Finally, ASPIRE staff provided workshops at the annual transition conference. These presentations focused on youth engagement, cultural sensitivity, and a collaborative panel of related service providers. Participants in these workshops were youth, family members, special education staff, and various community members.

Assistive Technology

During the 2016-2017 school year, a capacity building grant series known as Az-Tech provided the foundation for capacity building and systemic change in schools related to assistive technology (AT). Teams of educators known as Az-Tech grant teams participated in grant-funded training workshops in the fundamentals of AT and UDL. At the end of the year, teams were better equipped to consider and implement AT tools and strategies to support students with disabilities and contribute to the training of other education professionals in their local education agencies (LEAs).

One-day public and regional trainings: AT is in the mATH, iPads in the Classroom, Executive Functioning, AT Overview, Chrome Extensions to Support Struggling Students. Individualized in-person and telephone assistance to support teachers and other school district staff in the selection and implementation of various assistive technology devices, tools, and software to support students in accessing the curriculum was provided. These technical support services included text-to-speech software, speech-to-text software, SmartPens, mathematics supports, math manipulatives, equation editors, physical access to the environment and academic materials, Google Chrome Extensions, iPad applications, and Android applications.

Technical support also included specific research to overcome a specific barrier for individual students and included information in the following areas:

- Chrome extensions
- AT overviews
- Training on items that schools borrow from the Lending Library
- AAC support
- Eye gaze
- AAC apps
- Switch access for iPads
- AAC implementation

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- AT consideration
- AT evaluation
- AT for writing
- AT for reading
- AT for mobility
- AT for executive function
- AT for math
- Mobile technology (iPads, Android tablets)

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 2017-2018 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. SEAP was established in accordance with IDEA 97 and updated in IDEA 2004. The purpose for SEAP is to provide policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. 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 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 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

The annual performance report (APR) on the State's progress and/or slippage for FFY 2016 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 2016 Annual Performance Report*.

The annual public report (APR) on the State's progress an/or slippage for FFY 16 are available on the ADE/ESS Web site at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/> under the list titled Public Reports School Year 2016-2017, within 120 days of the February 2, 2018, submission of the APR.

These reports list the performance of each school district and charter school in Arizona on the SPP targets. The SPP/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/APR, as does Arizona's Parent and Training Information Center (Raising Special Kids). The ESS special education listserv, ESS and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) specialists, trainings, and conferences serve as the vehicles to notify parents, the PEAs, and the public of the availability of the SPP/APR. Special Education Monitoring Alerts, memoranda pertaining to specific topics including the SPP/APR, are sent to the field electronically on the ADE/ESS listserv and distributed by hard copy through the ESS specialists.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
ffy_17_spp-apr_ta.pdf	Connie Hargis	1/16/2019 9:06 AM	

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA.

The State's determinations for both 2017 and 2018 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2018 determination letter informed the State that it 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. The State provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. Although the State provided the required FFY 2017 data and a narrative report, the State did not report in the SPP/APR progress in implementing the State-identified coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies, or implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity.

Required Actions

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. With its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2016. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR due in February 2020, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies, and evidence-based practices that were implemented by the State and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data. If, in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State is not able demonstrate progress in implementing its coherent improvement strategies, including progress in the areas of infrastructure improvement strategies or the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity, the State must provide its root cause analysis for each of these challenges.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%
Data	64.42%	68.98%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017-2018 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,178	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,798	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	66.40%	Calculate

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
5,178	7,798	68.98%	80.00%	66.40%

Arizona's graduation rate target (80%) for students with IEPs in FFY 2017 SPP/APR is the same as the annual graduation rate target for all Arizona students under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 SPP/APR rate (68.98%) to the FFY 2017 SPP/APR rate (66.40%), a difference of 2.58%. It should be noted that the graduation rates for the state as a whole also decreased 2.16% from 80.18% in FFY 2016 to 78.02% in FFY 2017. A possible contributing factor for this slippage is that beginning with the graduating class of SY 2017, high school graduates are required to pass (60/100) a civics test identical to the civics portion of the naturalization test used by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. The drop in the percentage of four-year graduates may be related to this new testing requirement for students to earn regular high school diplomas.

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 (a) did not transfer to another qualified educational facility, (b) did not leave to be home schooled, or (c) were deceased. Students who receive a diploma prior to September 1 of the school year following their fourth year are included as a part of a four-year graduation cohort.

Conditions to Graduate with a Regular Diploma

Conditions that 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);

There are several requirements for graduation with a regular high school diploma in Arizona, which are publicly available online at: <https://www.azed.gov/adeinfo/hsggrad/>. First, high school students must complete 22 credits to graduate. The list below summarizes the *minimum* credit requirements for high school graduation in Arizona. School districts and charter schools may, at their discretion, establish additional graduation credit requirements for their students. These credits must include:

- English or English as a Second Language (4 credits)
- History & Social Science (3 credits)
- Mathematics (4 credits)
- Science (3 credits)
- Fine Arts - or - Career and Technical Education (1 credit)
- Locally prescribed courses (7 credits)

* Specific course requirements are outlined in Title 7 Chapter 2 of the Arizona Administrative Code.

In addition to the required credits for graduation, Arizona has a testing requirement.

A civics test is required beginning with the graduating class of 2017. High school graduates are required to pass (60/100) a civics test identical to the civics portion of the naturalization test used by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. As a courtesy, the Arizona Department of Education, with help from the Maricopa County Education Service Agency and Arizona educators, has developed a mostly multiple choice version of the required test.

*Passing AzMERIT statewide assessments are not a state requirement for graduation; however, PEAs may choose to develop their own academic or graduation requirements related to the AzMERIT assessment.

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)).
- Algebra II requirement may be modified using a Personal Curriculum as outlined in R7-2-302.03.

To compute each graduation rate, the following formula is used:

$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \text{Number of Graduates (G or W7 or S7)* in the Cohort} \div \text{Number of students in the Cohort}$$

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

*Year End Codes:

G= Graduate/Year-end

W7= Graduate/Withdrawal

S7= Graduate/Summer Withdrawal

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 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≤	27.90%	27.80%
Data	25.17%	26.85%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	27.70%	26.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017-2018 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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,749	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	16	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,773	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	20	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1,773	7,558	26.85%	27.70%	23.46%

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

Arizona uses the same data reported to the United States Department of Education under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to describe what counts as dropping out for all youth. A high school dropout is defined as an individual who meets all of the following: 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 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 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	93.60%	93.11%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	92.29%	93.18%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	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 2017 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 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	12352	12791	12643	11766	11015	10388	n	n	534	n	5424
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1441	1468	1469	1431	1312	1266					3671
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	9553	9933	9854	8891	8206	7642					1019
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											

FFY 2017 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	736	801	739	760	708	748			534		

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Math assessment participation data by grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	12429	12865	12706	11830	11082	10449	n	n	523	n	5141
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1464	1528	1507	1470	1326	1299					3365
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	9607	9946	9879	8916	8259	7670					1033
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	731	797	736	758	705	746			523		

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	76,913	72,182	93.11%	95.00%	93.85%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	77,025	72,265	93.18%	95.00%	93.82%

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 <https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5bc77d661dcb25070cd2b9c>.

The FFY 2017 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/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/specialeducation/sppapr/>, titled SPP/APR by Federal Fiscal Year. The Direct link to the document is: <https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5b3a54981dcb250dac3e0c03>

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments, and the number of children with disabilities participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, 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 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

FFY 2017 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	2016
Reading	A Grade 3	Target ≥	90.00%	92.00%
		Data	18.98%	17.00%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	89.00%	92.00%
		Data	18.49%	18.22%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	91.00%	93.00%
		Data	15.43%	13.95%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	92.00%	94.00%
		Data	11.42%	11.03%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	92.00%	94.00%
		Data	12.87%	11.33%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	88.00%	91.00%
		Data	9.07%	8.25%

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

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
	G HS	Target ≥	91.00%	93.00%
		Data	4.25%	5.80%
Math	A Grade 3	Target ≥	86.00%	90.00%
		Data	24.05%	22.13%
	B Grade 4	Target ≥	85.00%	89.00%
		Data	19.35%	19.32%
	C Grade 5	Target ≥	84.00%	88.00%
		Data	17.72%	17.61%
	D Grade 6	Target ≥	83.00%	87.00%
		Data	13.09%	12.31%
	E Grade 7	Target ≥	84.00%	88.00%
		Data	11.13%	9.43%
	F Grade 8	Target ≥	80.00%	85.00%
		Data	11.35%	9.74%
	G HS	Target ≥	84.00%	88.00%
		Data	3.60%	7.37%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	97.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	96.00%	98.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	96.00%	98.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	96.00%	98.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	94.00%	97.00%
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	98.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	93.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	92.00%	96.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	92.00%	96.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	91.00%	96.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	92.00%	96.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	90.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	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 2017 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 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 3/28/2019

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	11730	12202	12062	11082	10226	9656	n	n	534	n	4690
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	226	269	220	136	162	88					341
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1463	1565	1325	761	714	535					47
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	276	290	286	351	330	292			234		

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 3/28/2019

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	11802	12271	12122	11144	10290	9715	n	n	523	n	4398
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	368	280	227	173	105	88					313
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2274	1697	1472	1073	565	525					50
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	274	336	350	345	321	340			256		

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3	11,730	2,879	17.00%	95.00%	24.54%
B Grade 4	12,202	3,092	18.22%	95.00%	25.34%
C Grade 5	12,062	3,626	13.95%	96.00%	30.06%
D Grade 6	11,082	2,724	11.03%	96.00%	24.58%
E Grade 7	10,226	2,349	11.33%	96.00%	22.97%
F Grade 8	9,656	1,986	8.25%	94.00%	20.57%
G HS	4,690	953	5.80%	95.00%	20.32%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Grade 3	11,802	5,538	22.13%	93.00%	46.92%
B Grade 4	12,271	4,962	19.32%	92.00%	40.44%
C Grade 5	12,122	4,416	17.61%	92.00%	36.43%
D Grade 6	11,144	2,970	12.31%	91.00%	26.65%
E Grade 7	10,290	2,033	9.43%	92.00%	19.76%
F Grade 8	9,715	1,869	9.74%	90.00%	19.24%
G HS	4,398	981	7.37%	92.00%	22.31%

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 <https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5bd1f9611dcb250dcc2543c8>.

The FFY 2017 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/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/specialeducation/sppapr/> titled SPP/APR by Federal Fiscal Year. The direct link to the report is: <https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5b3a54981dcb250dac3e0c03>

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards, alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, 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 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	0%	0.46%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017-2018 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. The ADE/ESS data management coordinator trains data managers and administrators on the data requirements and requests input for improving the State’s data collection and reporting process.

FFY 2017 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. 605

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	34	0.46%	0%	0%

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The State has changed their calculation methodology, which necessitates a need to revise the baseline data to 2016 when the methodological changes took place.

7/15/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State's Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology: Beginning in FFY 2017, Arizona moved from the State Bar method for defining significant discrepancy to the Risk Ratio method to determine the likelihood of overrepresentation of a group when compared to another group. Arizona defines significant discrepancy as a rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days based on a risk ratio of 3.0 or greater.

Arizona compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among PEAs within the State. Calculation of the Risk Ratio is the PEA suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities divided by the State suspension/expulsion rate. If the ratio is greater than or equal to 3.0 for two consecutive years, the PEA is significantly discrepant.

Districts identified as having significant discrepancy are required to review and revise, if necessary, their policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.170 (b).

In addition, a PEA must meet the criteria for the minimum n-size and a minimum cell size. The State has set a risk ratio threshold (3.0), a minimum n-size (30), and a minimum cell size (10), per regulations § 20 U.S.C. 1418(d) and 34 CFR §§ 300.646 & 300.647.

Risk Ratio Threshold: The ratio at which a PEA is flagged as having a significant discrepancy. Arizona's Risk ratio threshold is 3.0 or 3 times as likely.

Minimums & Thresholds: ADE has set a risk ratio threshold of 3.0, a minimum cell size of 10, and a minimum n-size of 30 (deemed appropriate by OSEP).

Data Collection: Data are collected from all PEAs through the ADE Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as reported under section 618, Table 5 (report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for the 2016-2017 school year/grant year. The October 1, 2016 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 these data is from FFY 2016. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year due to the number of charter schools that may open or close from year to year.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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 rate by the State rate and identified 0 PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. If 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 the identified PEAs 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. The 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 30 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536. The PEA would have then reviewed its practices via a self-assessment and specifically conducted an assessment of the PEAs 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 reviews.

Upon completion of the reviews, Arizona would have then determined whether 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:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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 2017 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	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 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. 629

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	10	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State has changed their calculation methodology, which necessitates a need to revise the baseline data to 2016 when the methodological changes took place.

State's Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology: Beginning in FFY 2017, Arizona moved from the State Bar method for defining significant discrepancy to the Risk Ratio method to determine the likelihood of overrepresentation of a group when compared to another group. Arizona defines significant discrepancy as a rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days based on a risk ratio of 3.0 or greater.

Arizona compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among PEAs within the State. Calculation of the Risk Ratio is the PEA suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities divided by the State suspension/expulsion rate. If the ratio is greater than or equal to 3.0 for two consecutive years, the PEA is significantly discrepant.

Districts identified as having significant discrepancy are required to review and revise, if necessary, their policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.170 (b).

In addition, a PEA must meet the criteria for the minimum n-size and a minimum cell size. The State has set a risk ratio threshold (3.0), a minimum n-size (30), and a minimum cell size (10), per regulations § 20 U.S.C. 1418(d) and 34 CFR §§ 300.646 & 300.647.

Risk Ratio Threshold: The ratio at which a PEA is flagged as having a significant discrepancy. Arizona's Risk ratio threshold is 3.0 or 3

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

times as likely.

Minimums & Thresholds: ADE has set a risk ratio threshold of 3.0, a minimum cell size of 10, and a minimum n-size of 30 (deemed appropriate by OSEP).

Data Collection: Data are collected from all PEAs through the ADE Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as reported under section 618, Table 5 (report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for the 2016-2017 school year/grant year. The October 1, 2016, 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 these data is from FFY 2016. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year due to the number of charter schools that may open or close from year to year.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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 0 PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. If 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 the identified PEAs 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. The 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 30 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536. The PEA would have then reviewed its practices via a self-assessment and specifically conducted an assessment of the PEAs 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 reviews.

Upon completion of the 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 2016

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.

--

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational 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	2016
A	Target ≥	64.00%	64.50%
	Data	64.94%	65.76%
B	Target ≤	15.00%	14.90%
	Data	14.76%	14.74%
C	Target ≤	2.00%	2.00%
	Data	2.11%	1.99%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017-2018 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	124,185	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,668	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,622	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	2,455	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	104	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	339	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,668	124,185	65.76%	65.00%	66.57%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,622	124,185	14.74%	14.70%	14.19%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,898	124,185	1.99%	2.00%	2.33%

Reasons for C Slippage

The slippage was a result of an adjustment in the definition of separate schools and subsequent reclassification of children with IEPs in this category. This adjustment was made based on TA from OSEP regarding students being served in the category of separate schools to accurately represent where public programs reside in districts and how they operate both as part of and separate from a school, if on school premises. Separate program buildings were also revised to accurately reflect that they are not a school open to general enrollment, which has created more accurate data reporting of PEA/school level membership.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
A	Target ≥	50.50%	51.00%
	Data	51.36%	51.36%
B	Target ≤	44.60%	44.40%
	Data	42.36%	42.22%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017-2018 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	16,517	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	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	8,934	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	6,543	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	53	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	8,934	16,517	51.36%	51.50%	54.09%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,596	16,517	42.22%	44.20%	39.93%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2017	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	2017	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	2017	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	2017	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	2017	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	2017	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	2016
A1	Target ≥	80.50%	81.00%
	Data	78.66%	79.01%
A2	Target ≥	63.50%	64.00%
	Data	58.59%	60.31%
B1	Target ≥	79.50%	80.00%
	Data	79.21%	78.55%
B2	Target ≥	62.50%	63.00%
	Data	59.07%	59.36%
C1	Target ≥	76.50%	77.00%
	Data	70.68%	78.69%
C2	Target ≥	67.50%	68.00%
	Data	60.07%	80.86%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017-2018 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

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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. 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 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3,171
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	281	8.87%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	548	17.29%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	744	23.48%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,012	31.93%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	584	18.43%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1756.00	2585.00	79.01%	81.50%	67.93%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1596.00	3169.00	60.31%	64.50%	50.36%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

Arizona's Outcome 7A1 target for students in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 64.5%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 60.31% to 48.54%.

A possible contributing factor for this slippage is the increase of approximately 1000 additional students reported in the FFY 17 year. The increase in numbers was due to TA provided to LEAs when exiting children using the Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) program; not all LEAs understood about the program's mechanism for exiting students. In addition, ADE's Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Unit has provided professional development and technical assistance primarily in the area of social-emotional skills during FFY 17, which may have increased PEA understanding of those skills and functioning to more accurately score students on the TSG rubric. There have also been changes to the data entry platform, which may have added to the slippage for both A1 and A2. There have also been changes to the data entry platform: features which had previously allowed teachers to select higher than age level expectations were no longer as readily apparent in the program, which may have added to the slippage for both A1 & A2.

Reasons for A2 Slippage

Arizona's Outcome 7A1 target for students in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 81.5%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 79.01% to 67.74%.

In addition to the possible contributing factors in 7A1, community partners provided professional development on the Adverse Childhood Experiences study (ACEs) as well as for the first time hosted and Social Emotional Summit which may have increased PEA understanding of the social-emotional skills demonstrated by students in comparison to same age peers without disabilities. Also, it should be noted that stakeholders are reporting an increase in more challenging social-emotional behaviors in classroom settings.

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	316	9.97%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	547	17.26%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	757	23.89%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,011	31.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	538	16.98%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1768.00	2631.00	78.55%	80.50%	67.20%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1549.00	3169.00	59.36%	63.50%	48.88%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

Arizona's Outcome 7B1 target for students in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 80.50%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 78.55% to 55.22%.

A contributing factor for this slippage is the change in the scoring process of Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG), which changed its methodology in 2019, affecting both entry and exit scoring moving forward. The previous scoring process included an additional 12 items that have now been removed due to inconsistent use and non-progressive scoring. The new, revised scoring process is reflective of OSEP's proscribed early childhood outcomes on the SPP/APR measurement table. The TSG scoring process uses raw scores converted to a 7-point scale that compares students with disabilities to their same-age peers. The main scoring change was the removal of 12 items that resulted in lower, but more accurate scores.

Reasons for B2 Slippage

Arizona's Outcome 7B2 target for students in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 63.50%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 59.36% to 48.73%.

As noted above, the contributing factor for this slippage is the change in the scoring process of Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) which changed its methodology in 2019, affecting both entry and exit scoring moving forward. The previous scoring process included an additional 12 items that have now been removed due to inconsistent use and non-progressive scoring. The new, revised scoring process is reflective of OSEP's proscribed early childhood outcomes on the SPP/APR measurement table.

The TSG scoring process uses raw scores converted to a 7-point scale that compares students with disabilities to their same-age peers. The main scoring change was the removal of 12 items that resulted in lower, but more accurate scores.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	305	9.62%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	851	26.84%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	663	20.91%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	824	25.99%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	528	16.65%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1487.00	2643.00	78.69%	77.50%	56.26%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1352.00	3171.00	80.86%	68.50%	42.64%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

Arizona's Outcome 7C1 target for students in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 77.50%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 78.69% to 55.16%.

The contributing factor for this slippage is the change in the scoring process of Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) which changed its methodology in fall 2018. Raw scores weren't usefully categorizing student outcomes according to developmental progress and concerns from stakeholder groups were reported nationally that too many children were scoring Meets expectations or Exceeds expectations. The scoring was adjusted with raw scores converted to a 9-point scale (1-5 Below, 6 Meets, 7-9 Exceeds). Raw score means for typically developing children were calculated along with the standard deviation. Z-scores were adjusted for reasonableness,

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
and same age comparisons occur among 3-month bands.

Reasons for C2 Slippage

Arizona's Outcome 7C2 target for students in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 68.50%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 80.86% to 42.49%.

As discussed above, the contributing factor for this slippage is the change in the scoring process of Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) which changed its methodology in fall 2018. Raw scores weren't usefully categorizing student outcomes according to developmental progress and concerns from stakeholder groups were reported nationally that too many children were scoring Meets expectations or Exceeds expectations. The scoring was adjusted with raw scores converted to a 9-point scale (1-5 Below, 6 Meets, 7-9 Exceeds). Raw score means for typically developing children were calculated along with the standard deviation. Z-scores were adjusted for reasonableness, and same age comparisons occur among 3-month bands.

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 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	59.00%	61.00%
Data	92.05%	85.22%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	63.00%	65.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

All school districts and charter schools in Arizona are required to annually administer the nine-question Parent Involvement Survey to all parents of students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) The Parent Involvement survey consists of 8 Likert-scaled questions and one open-ended question. The survey was developed through a collaboration with ADE Research and Evaluation, ADE/ESS staff, and Raising Special Kids staff (Arizona's parent training and information center). In addition, it was field-tested during the 2014-2015 school year. ADE statisticians determined the field-tested survey was valid and reliable after an exhaustive analysis of parent responses.

ADE/ESS staff have presented the survey process and results to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) each year to gather feedback and recommendations on the use and effectiveness of the survey. 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. 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.

According to the feedback received from SEAP during the June 2018 meeting, parents and other stakeholder groups discussed their appreciation with the ease of use for the Parent Involvement Survey online. Additional feedback was given on the use of log in codes, and the possibility of extending the survey window in order to have the opportunity to gather a greater number of parent responses.

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
10,491	11,300	85.22%	63.00%	92.84%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

8.15%

138694.00

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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Every parent who has a child with an IEP has the opportunity to complete the survey using the web-based data collection system. Thus, a census of parents has the opportunity to complete the survey. The survey completed by parents of children with an IEP in preschool is the same survey completed by parents of children with an IEP in all age groups.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

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/ESS ensures that the Indicator 8 parent involvement survey data are valid and reliable. ADE/ESS provides extensive, ongoing TA to PEAs by providing every PEA special education director 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 TA to maximize parental responses and involvement rates.

Data analysis of respondents' race/ethnicity and child age confirmed results are representative of the state special education population with slightly lower representation for Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino of Any Race, and for students in age group 14-22 which is discussed with the tables below.

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

	Eligible	Surveyed	Resp %	Population%
Hispanic/Latino of Any Race	62542	4688	41.49%	45.09%
American Indian or Alaska Native	8212	631	5.58%	5.92%
Asian	1921	200	1.77%	1.39%
Black or African American	8609	543	4.81%	6.21%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	376	22	0.19%	0.27%
White	52680	4873	43.12%	37.98%
Two or More Races	4354	343	3.04%	3.14%
Total	138694	11300		

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 Black/African-American (4.81%) and Hispanic parents (41.09%) are lower than the State special education population data of 6.21% and 45.09% respectively. It is possible that the responses in these categories were influenced by respondents from small and/or rural PEAs servicing these race/ethnicity groups who may not have had the technological resources needed to support the technology needs of their families in completing the Parent Survey. In the future, ADE/ESS staff will provide TA in this area of concern in order to increase the response rates for Black/African-American and Hispanic parents.

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

	Eligible	Surveyed	Resp %	Population%
Ages 3-5	16188	1501	13.28%	11.67%
Ages 6-13	81944	7202	63.73%	59.08%
Ages 14-22	40562	2597	22.98%	29.25%
Total	138694	11300		

Table 8.2 shows the response rate is slightly higher than the state rate with the age group statistics for parents of children ages 3-5 and 6-13. The response rate is lower than the age group statistics for parents of children aged 14-22. This may be due to the greater autonomy and separation from their parents of children in this age category. A continuing area of focus for TA from ADE/ESS is in increasing the response rate for the age group of parents of children aged 14-22.

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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: 2017

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	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell 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. 152

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	494	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).

The State has changed their calculation methodology, which necessitates a need to revise the baseline data to 2016 when the methodological changes took place.

State's Definition of Disproportionate Representation and Methodology:

Beginning in FFY 2017, Arizona moved from the Weighted Risk Ratio for defining disproportionate representation to the Risk Ratio method to determine the likelihood of overrepresentation of a group when compared to another group. Arizona defines disproportionate representation as a rate of greater than or equal to 3.0 within a group compared to another group by race/ethnicity.

Arizona compares the rates of identification for children with IEPs to children without IEPs within the PEA, by race/ethnicity. Calculation of the Risk Ratio is the PEA identification rate for children with disabilities divided by the PEA race/ethnicity rate for children without disabilities. If the ratio is greater than or equal to 3.0, for two years in a row, the PEA is considered to have disproportionate representation. Due to the two-year process for PEAs to be considered to have disproportionate representation, the State will update its baseline data in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR to reflect the two years of data needed for the full change in methodology to take place.

Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are required to review and revise, if necessary, their policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.170 (b).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In addition, a PEA must meet the criteria for the minimum n size and a minimum cell size. The State has set a risk ratio threshold, and minimum n-size and cell size, per regulations § 20 U.S.C. 1418(d) and 34 CFR §§ 300.646 & 300.647.

Risk Ratio Threshold: The ratio at which a PEA is flagged as having a disproportionate representation (3.0).

Alternate Risk Ratio: An alternate risk ratio is used for any PEA that does not meet the minimum cell size (10) or minimum n-size (30). The alternate risk ratio compares the risk of a specific outcome for a specific group within the PEA with the state ratios for that specific group.

Minimums & Thresholds: ADE has set a risk ratio threshold of 3.0, a minimum cell size of 10, and an n-size of 30 (deemed appropriate by OSEP).

Data Collection:

Data are collected from all PEAs for the 2017-2018 school year/grant year. The October 1, 2017 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. In addition, the State uses the October 1 enrollment for all enrolled students in the State.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 overrepresentation, according to the State's definition of significant disproportionate representation. When a PEA is flagged, then the policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures: Arizona requires all PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 30 CFR § 300.11, §§ 300.201 and 300.301 prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. ESS/PSM reviews PEA policies, and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the monitoring cycle. If the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

PEAs have notified the ADE/ESS of any current revisions made to their special education policies and procedures.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices : On an annual basis, Arizona calculates the Risk Ratio 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 overrepresentation for two or more consecutive years:

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, then PEAs, with the support of ESS program specialists, conduct the following:
 - An ADE/ESS specialist reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.
 - Validates the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
 - The PEA conducts a self-assessment of the agency's child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the 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 specialist conducts 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.
- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, 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:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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 2016 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 2016

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 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 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: 2017

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	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell 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. 276

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	370	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).

The State has changed their calculation methodology, which necessitates a need to revise the baseline data to 2016 when the methodological changes took place.

State's Definition of Disproportionate Representation and Methodology:

Beginning in FFY 2017, Arizona moved from the Weighted Risk Ratio method for defining disproportionate representation to the Risk Ratio method to determine the likelihood of overrepresentation of a group when compared to another group. Arizona defines disproportionate representation as a rate of greater than or equal to 3.0 within a group compared to another group by race/ethnicity by disability category.

Arizona compares the rates of identification for children with IEPs to children without IEPs within the PEA, by race/ethnicity by disability category. Calculation of the Risk Ratio is the PEA identification rate for children with disabilities in a specific disability category divided by the PEAs identification rate for children with disabilities in all other disability categories. If the ratio is greater than or equal to 3.0, for two years in a row, the PEA is considered to have disproportionate representation. Due to the two-year process for PEAs to be considered to have disproportionate representation, the State will update its baseline data in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR to reflect the two years of data needed for the full change in methodology to take place.

Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are required to review and revise, if necessary, their policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.170 (b).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In addition, a PEA must meet the criteria for the minimum n size and a minimum cell size. The State has set a risk ratio threshold, and minimum n-size & cell size, per regulations § 20 U.S.C. 1418(d) and 34 CFR §§ 300.646 & 300.647.

Risk Ratio Threshold: The ratio at which a PEA is flagged as having a disproportionate representation (3.0).

Alternate Risk Ratio: An alternate risk ratio is used for any PEA that does not meet the minimum cell size (10) or minimum n-size (30). The alternate risk ratio compares the risk of a specific outcome for a specific group within the PEA with the state ratios for that specific group.

Minimums & Thresholds: ADE has set a risk ratio threshold of 3.0, a minimum cell size of 10, and an n-size of 30 (deemed appropriate by OSEP).

Data Collection:

Data are collected from all PEAs for the 2017-2018 school year/grant year. The October 1, 2017 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.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 overrepresentation, according to the State's definition of significant disproportionate representation. When a PEA is flagged, then the policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures: Arizona requires all PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 30 CFR § 300.11, §§ 300.201 and 300.301 prior to having Part B-IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. ESS/PSM reviews PEA policies, and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the monitoring cycle. If the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

PEAs have notified the ADE/ESS of any current revisions made to their special education policies and procedures.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices : On an annual basis, Arizona calculates the Risk Ratio 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 overrepresentation for two or more consecutive years:

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, then PEAs with the support of ESS program specialists conduct the following:
 - An ADE/ESS specialist reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.
 - Validates the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
 - The PEA conducts a self-assessment of the agency's child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the 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 specialist conducts 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.
- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, 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:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 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 2016 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 2016

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 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.82%	94.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
739	719	94.63%	100%	97.29%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	20
---	----

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 2017 Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidents of noncompliance	Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/18/19
20	20

Range of Days beyond the Timeline:

Range of days: 1-180

Mean: 37.24

Median: 30

Mode: 4

Reasons for the delays included:

- lack of tracking system to alert school to the timeline (5)
- unavailability of student* (absences, illness, etc.) (1)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- interruption in school calendar (spring or summer break) (2)
- miscalculation of 60-day timeline (3)
- unavailability of required personnel (parent, general education teacher, etc.) (3)
- lack of understanding of the evaluation process (5)
- lack of understanding that an extension could be used (1).

The reason for the longest delay (180 days) was an interruption in school calendar.

*Unavailability of student does not include the parent of a child repeatedly failing or refusing to produce the child for evaluation.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 11 are from the Arizona monitoring system. During FFY 2016, the monitoring system changed from collecting data for public education agencies (PEAs) selected based on a prior risk assessment tool – only PEAs scoring at risk on the tool were monitored for indicators 11 & 13. During FFY 16, the sampling methodology used to determine file sample provided a smaller sample. Finally, in FFY 16, the monitoring activities were largely PEA self-reported. For FFY 2017, PEAs were selected based on cycle year, as a result of a score on the risk analysis tool (which has been redeveloped to more closely align with the SPP/APR indicators) and by using data from a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. PEAs selected for monitoring complete a review of files for both Indicators 11 & 13, discussed further below. 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 increased from FFY 2016. FFY 2017 monitoring processes include a representative student file sampling methodology as well as a validation process for any self-reported monitoring data.

Data Collection

Data are collected from the selected PEAs during one of three types of monitoring based on their cycle year data, use of a risk assessment tool, and other factors as described above.

Data Review: Selected PEAs review a representative sample of files for Indicators 11 and 13. A Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) specialist validates the data. If the representative sample validation is 100% compliant, this part of the process is completed. If the representative sample validation is not 100% compliant, subsequent files are reviewed and validated. Findings of noncompliance are corrected during the monitoring process.

Self-Assessment: Each selected PEA reviews a representative sample of files around an outcome focus area, in addition to Indicators 11 and 13. A PSM specialist validates the data. If the representative sample validation is 100% compliant, this part of the process is completed. If the representative sample validation is not 100% compliant, subsequent files are reviewed and validated. Findings of noncompliance are corrected during the monitoring process.

On-Site: The PEA team and PSM specialist team conduct comprehensive file reviews of a representative student sample, including Indicators 11 and 13. A PSM specialist will follow up throughout the course of the following corrective action year to ensure individual instances of noncompliance and systemic level correction are both evidenced, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02)*. Results may include a 60-day corrective action timeline for FAPE prohibitive noncompliance identified.

The data that Arizona collected and reported for this Indicator include a representative sample of children in the selected PEAs whose permissions to evaluate were received during FFY 2017 (SY 2017-2018) and for whom initial evaluations including eligibility determinations were completed during FFY 2017 (SY 2017-2018).

Valid and Reliable Data

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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 2017

During FFY 2017, 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.

*OSEP Memo 09-02 can be found on the IDEA website at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/idea-files/osep-memo-09-02-reporting-on-correction-of-noncompliance/>

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 2016

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

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

FFY 16 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

The ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) specialists reviewed the child-specific files from the monitoring 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, and documented through the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) closeout process within one year of identification of noncompliance. The PSM 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) and consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02)*.

* OSEP Memo 09-02 can be found on the IDEA website at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/idea-files/osep-memo-09-02-reporting-on-correction-of-noncompliance/>

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:

- PSM 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, if not already completed, and was documented and verified through the CAP closeout process.
- PSM specialists reviewed 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 evaluation.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

--

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.08%	99.07%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,107
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	519
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,438
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.	104
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	16
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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	2,438	2,468	99.07%	100%	98.78%

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	30
--	----

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:12

Interruption of school schedule:10

Did not pass vision/hearing:1

Shortage of personnel:7

Total = 30

In FFY 2017, a total of 30 children were not transitioned on time due to late referrals from Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) (12), interruption of school schedule (10), shortage of personnel (7), or not passing vision/hearing (1). This is compared to a total of 21 in FFY 7/15/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2016, 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 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.

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/ESCE 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, PEAs, and Part C agencies. This has helped Part C service coordinators encouraging families to have regular hearing and vision screenings.

Range of Days Beyond Third Birthday

Range of Days 2-66*

*The 66 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, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Data Collection

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

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ECSE unit assures the validity and reliability of the data as they are 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 results in a written notification to the PEA by the State that the PEA is noncompliant.

FFY 2017 Noncompliance

# findings of noncompliance	# of findings corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 8/01/2018
30	30

Arizona made 30 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017. Although the PEAs had one year to correct the noncompliance, all 30 findings were corrected as of August 1, 2018.

Actions required in FFY 2016 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 7/15/2019

FFY 2017 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2016 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 FFY2016 SPP/APR response, Arizona verified that each PEA with noncompliance reflected in the data:

- All instances of noncompliance were verified for each PEA with noncompliance indicated in FFY 2017 for this indicator:
 1. The PEA 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;
 - a. Subsequent PEA data are sent to the SEA and reviewed for compliance
 - b. SEA (Part C and B) transition policies are reviewed to ensure sufficient and accurate messaging;
 - c. Upon notification of delays, the SEA provides timely feedback to Part C and PEAs to intervene
 - d. Each of the PEAs submit In-By-Three policies and procedures for review and feedback
 2. and; has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the PEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008
 - a. Each PEA submits the cover page of the IEP for each child not found eligible by their third birthday to ensure that the child was provided with an IEP or the or the PWN for those children found ineligible for special education

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

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 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.39%	85.61%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
445	530	85.61%	100%	83.96%

Reasons for Slippage

During FFY 2016, the monitoring system changed from collecting data for PEAs selected based on a prior risk assessment tool – only PEAs scoring at risk on the tool were monitored for indicators 11 and 13. During this redevelopment, the sampling methodology used to determine the file sample yielded a smaller size. Also in FFY 16, the monitoring activities were largely PEA self-reported. Several of these changes implemented in the FFY 2016 monitoring redesign may continue to contribute to the slippage in FFY 2017 as discussed below. Finally, after the monitoring system redevelopment in FFY 2016, different PEAs are represented in each monitoring cycle year. This may also contribute to slippage, as different PEAs will receive TA on meeting compliance on this indicator until all PEAs in the state have gone through monitoring. It should be noted that the adjustments to the data collection method resulted in a sharp increase in the number of files reviewed, and this increase likely contributed to the slippage in the indicator. Finally, another possible contributor to slippage is additional training on inter-rater reliability provided to program specialists conducting monitoring activities - an increase in data quality likely resulted in more noncompliant indicator 13 decisions in file reviews.

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidence of noncompliance

85

Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/30/19

27

Arizona made 85 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, 27 findings

Data Source

The data for Indicator 13 are from the Arizona monitoring system. Beginning in FFY 2017, the monitoring system began selecting PEAs for monitoring each fiscal year based on cycle year, and the results of a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. During FFY 16, the sampling methodology used to determine file sample provided a smaller sample. In FFY 16, the monitoring activities were largely PEA self-reported. For FFY 2017, PEAs were selected based cycle year, and as a result of a score on the risk analysis tool (which has been redeveloped to more closely align with the SPP/APR indicators), and by using data from a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. PEAs selected for monitoring complete a review of files for both Indicators 11 & 13, discussed further below. FFY 2017 monitoring processes included a representative student file sampling methodology as well as validation process for any self-reported monitoring data. Both the reported number of youth with IEPs aged 16-21, and the number of youth aged 16-21 with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition reflect this increase in the number of files reviewed each year by the Arizona monitoring system.

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 postsecondary 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 selected PEAs during one of three types of monitoring based on their cycle year, use of a risk assessment tool, and other factors described above:

Data Review: Selected PEAs review a representative sample of files for Indicators 11 and 13. A PSM specialist validates the data. If the representative sample validation is 100% compliant, this part of the process is completed. If the representative sample validation is not 100% compliant, subsequent files are reviewed and validated. Findings of noncompliance are corrected during the monitoring process.

Self-Assessment: Each selected PEA reviews a representative sample of files around an outcome focus area, in addition to Indicators 11 and 13. A PSM specialist validates the data. If the representative sample validation is 100% compliant, this part of the process is completed. If the representative sample validation is not 100% compliant, subsequent files are reviewed and validated. Findings of noncompliance are corrected during the monitoring process.

On-Site: The PEA team and PSM specialist team conduct comprehensive file reviews of a representative student sample, including Indicators 11 and 13. PSM specialists follow up throughout the course of the following corrective action year to ensure individual instances of noncompliance and systemic level correction are both evidenced, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02)*. Results may include a 60-day corrective action timeline for FAPE prohibitive noncompliance identified.

The data that Arizona collects and reported for this Indicator include a representative sample of children in the selected PEAs who were 16-21 years of age at the time of monitoring.

Valid and Reliable Data

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

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2017

During FFY 2017, a finding for Indicator 13 was issued when the line item for secondary transition was found to be noncompliant. Each line item includes all 8 components, if there is a finding of noncompliance for any component, then the entire line is 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.

*OSEP Memo 09-02 can be found on the IDEA website at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/idea-files/osep-memo-09-02-reporting-on-correction-of-noncompliance/>.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2016 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 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
40	40	0	0

FFY 2016 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 PSM specialists reviewed the child-specific files from the monitoring to determine that the PEAs included the eight components of the secondary transition requirements for the students' IEPs, unless the child was no longer within the PEA, or graduated, and documented through the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) closeout process within one year of identification of noncompliance. The PSM 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), and consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02*).

* OSEP Memo 09-02 can be found on the IDEA website at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/idea-files/osep-memo-09-02-reporting-on-correction-of-noncompliance/>

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:

- PSM 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, and was documented and verified through the CAP closeout process.
- PSM specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files 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 the specific regulatory requirements related to secondary transition in conformity with 34 CFR §§ 300.302 (b) and 300.321 (b).

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
A	Target ≥	29.60%	31.10%
	Data	22.36%	22.79%
B	Target ≥	64.20%	66.20%
	Data	61.34%	63.55%
C	Target ≥	76.70%	78.00%
	Data	74.98%	77.66%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	32.60%	34.10%
Target B ≥	68.20%	70.20%
Target C ≥	79.30%	80.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2017–2018 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; state and local education officials; representatives of state agencies: Division of Developmental Disabilities, Vocational Rehabilitation, Arizona Department of Education, and Employment First.

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 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2017 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	6833.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1470.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2710.00
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)	626.00
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).	337.00

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1470.00	6833.00	22.79%	32.60%	21.51%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4180.00	6833.00	63.55%	68.20%	61.17%
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)	5143.00	6833.00	77.66%	79.30%	75.27%

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.

Reasons for A Slippage

Arizona's Post-School Outcomes target for exited students enrolled in higher education in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR is 32.60%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2016 rate of 22.79% to the FFY 2017 SPP/APR rate of 21.51%.

A possible contributing factor for this slippage may be the discrepancy between youth with disabilities entering college, but not completing a full term. Another possible contributing factor could be the challenges youth with disabilities face in both requesting and receiving accommodations in higher education settings. A final possible contributing factor may be that the number of students who exit due to aging out is increasing. The lack of a regular high school diploma for these students may impact the number of youth continuing on to higher education settings.

It should be noted that the data shows this year's cohort of students who qualified as emotionally disabled (ED) performed better than the cohort in FFY 16. More students with ED are entering higher education than in previous data collection years.

Reasons for B Slippage

In addition to the explanations provided above, a possible contributing factor may be that an increase in the minimum wage in Arizona has created greater competition for jobs among all individuals in the state. It should be noted that Engage for Change, technical assistance from the National Deaf Center on Postsecondary Outcomes, may have assisted in increasing the engagement of youth identified with a Hearing Impairment.

Reasons for C Slippage

In addition to the explanations provided in both A and B slippage sections, a possible contributing factor may be that teachers or specialists who conduct the PSO survey may not be asking additional probing questions (outside of the standard survey verbiage) needed to place the respondents in the correct PSO category. Another possible contributor to C slippage could be the anecdotal reporting of an increase of students taking a "gap" year, or a year off, in between completion of high school and post school engagement in higher education or employment. Finally, a possible contribution for slippage in all areas could be the challenges for youth with disabilities in finding reliable transportation to job, school, or other training opportunities.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The ADE/ESS used the Response Calculator developed by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) 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 2016-2017. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of +/- 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an underrepresentativeness of the group, and positive differences indicate overrepresentativeness.

Respondents were representative of all 2016-2017 target leavers based on gender, ethnicity, graduation status, and category of disability (see table 14.1). As in previous years, youth who dropped out of school were underrepresented compared to the target leaver group. 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 NTACT guidance document for contacting hard-to-find youth is provided to PEAs during PSO trainings and is posted on the ADE/ESS PSO website.

Table 14.1: State of AZ Respondents' Representativeness

By Disability Category	Responded	Total Leavers	Percent
Arizona	6910	8194	84.33%

By Disability Category	Responded	Total Leavers	Percent
A	572	649	88.14%
ED	542	715	75.80%
EDP	164	196	83.67%
HI	61	68	89.71%
MD	115	125	92.00%
MDSSI	39	41	95.12%
MIID	360	407	88.45%
MOID	146	159	91.82%
OHI	726	845	85.92%
OI	21	23	91.30%
SID	29	30	96.67%
SLD	4022	4806	83.69%
SLI	57	64	89.06%
TBI	31	36	86.11%
VI	25	30	83.33%

By Gender	Responded	Total Leavers	Percent
Female	2395	2842	84.27%
Male	4515	5352	84.36%

By Race/Ethnicity	Responded	Total Leavers	Percent
AM	554	641	86.42%
AS	63	68	92.65%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

BL	530	655	80.92%
HL	2979	3524	84.53%
MU	157	195	80.51%
PI	14	19	73.68%
WH	2613	3092	84.51%

By Exit Reason	Responded	Total Leavers	Percent
Dropped out	1341	2015	66.55%
Graduated with diploma	5550	6157	90.14%
Reached maximum age	19	22	86.36%

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

During FFY 2017, 265 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, 158 or 60% of PEAs that were required to participate in the PSO data collection had ten or fewer leavers while 20 or 7.5% of PEAs had 100 or more leavers. A total of 8,194 youth statewide were eligible to take the PSO Survey during the FFY17 data collection period. Of the 265 PEAs required to participate in the PSO Survey, 261 (98%) met the requirement.

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 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, 2018, after they were out of school for at least one year.

Missing Data

Arizona's PSO response rate for FFY 2017 was 84.33% (8,194 youth eligible for contact and 6,910 respondents). The FFY 2017 PSO Survey is missing data on 1,284 former students or 15.67% of the leavers. An analysis of missing data indicated that the largest segments of missing data were the result of four factors:

- Schools were not able to contact leavers after three attempts (740 former students or 9%)
- Schools did not have correct contact information for leavers (351 former students or 4%)
- Schools did not collect contact information for leavers (72 former students or <1%)
- The respondents refused to participate (121 former student or <2%)

Selection Bias

Respondents to the survey were underrepresentative 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

As noted in Table 14.1 the FFY 2017 survey response rate was 6,910 of the 8,194 youth eligible to take the survey, or 84.33% of leavers. The total of youth who were eligible was adjusted for those who had returned to school or were deceased, or whose data were uploaded by the PEA to the system in error.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	66.00%	67.00%
Data	59.09%	55.56%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017			2018		
Target	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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	12	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
6	12	55.56%	68.00% - 78.00%	50.00%

Reasons for Slippage

In FFY15, 13 of 22 resolution sessions resulted in resolution agreements. In FFY16, 10 of 18 resolution sessions resulted in resolution agreements, a 3.53% decrease. In FFY17, 6 of 12 resolution sessions resulted in resolution agreements, a 5.56% decrease. However, with low denominators like 22, 18, and 12, a 5.56% 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 FFY17, 12 resolution sessions were held pursuant to due process hearing requests, with 6 matters (50.00%) resulting in resolution agreements. This reflects slippage from FFY16 (55.56%). Of the 12 resolution sessions held, 6 resulted in resolution agreements; 14 matters were pending a due process hearing as of June 30, 2018; three matters were withdrawn by the complaining party: two complaints were dismissed by the administrative law judge; and 22 matters were resolved through a settlement

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
agreement outside of the resolution session process.

It is noteworthy that of the 64 due process complaints filed:

- 2 resulted in fully adjudicated hearings;
- 14 were pending as of June 30, 2018;
- 6 were resolved through a formal resolution agreement;
- 15 were resolved via mediation agreement; and
- 48 were dismissed or withdrawn
 - Of the 48 that were withdrawn, 22 were due to resolutions achieved via private settlement

Thus, although Arizona did not meet its target of 68-78% on this indicator, of the 48 matters that were resolved without a hearing by or before June 30, 2018, 43 or 89.58% 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 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2016
Target ≥	76.00%	78.00%
Data	78.26%	57.50%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017			2018		
Target	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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	22	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	15	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	48	null

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
22	15	48	57.50%	74.00% - 84.00%	77.08%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 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	2017
Target ≥		14.60%	6.40%	7.90%	9.40%
Data	14.20%	0.69%	6.40%		

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

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	10.90%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The original target data were incorrect in the SPP/APR, and are being updated to reflect the correct targets in the SSIP.

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 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 2017 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 of Exceptional Student Services

Email: alissa.trollinger@azed.gov

Phone: 602-364-4004