

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Arizona



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) has a system of general supervision that 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 that identifies and corrects noncompliance. Fiscal operations administers IDEA entitlement funding and 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 requests 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.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

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 2019–2020 school year:

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

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

- Annual site visits
- Review of policies and procedures
- Preparing for monitoring
- Differentiated monitoring activities
- Completion of individual and systemic corrective action

During the 2019–2020 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.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

670

General Supervision System

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

Dispute resolution is part of the general supervision system. The SEA operates IDEA dispute resolution activities through the ADE/Dispute Resolution section, which has 5 designated investigators who respond to citizens who alert the SEA to alleged noncompliance by public education agencies. Complainants may submit a complaint, in either English and Spanish, online, through fax, or via U.S. mail. Additional language translation is available upon request. The investigators review all complaints and draft reports making determinations of compliance. ADE/Dispute Resolution also has a designated compliance coordinator who ensures that corrective actions are completed. ADE/Dispute Resolution regularly interfaces with the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) unit to analyze trends and ensure consistency in supervision and technical assistance. ADE/Dispute Resolution maintains a database that enables the collaboration between the various units that perform general supervision functions. It also manages the due process complaint system and provides access to mediation in line with IDEA and its implementing regulation requirements.

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 during onsite visits, regional meetings, conferences, and other events. Electronic and virtual professional development and technical assistance is provided via email, through the consultant of the day (COD) telephone line, and via virtual software and meeting platforms. Technical assistance materials are found throughout the ADE/ESS websites at: <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation>, including the Arizona Technical Assistance System (AZ-TAS) documents webpage: <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/az-tas-documents>, as well as information found on the ADE/ESS Promising Practices website: <https://www.azpromisingpractices.com/>. During the 2019–2020 school year, ADE/ESS found it necessary to provide additional technical assistance, initially related to COVID-19, through a newly developed COVID-19-specific website as well as through weekly virtual meetings for special education administrators located throughout Arizona.

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.

Please see the Professional Development System attachment for an explanation of Arizona's Technical Assistance and Professional Development System.

Stakeholder Involvement

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 2019–2020 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 after 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.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

Reporting to the Public/FFY 2018

The annual performance report (APR) on the State’s progress and/or slippage for FFY 2018 is available on the ADE/ESS website:

<https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/sppapr/>, under the list titled State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) titled SPP/APR FFY 2018.

The public reporting on the FFY 2018 performance of each public education agency located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan is located on the ADE/ESS website under the list titled State Performance by Indicator. Under each indicator accordion menu is the option to select FFY 2018.

Reporting to the Public/FFY 2017

The annual performance report (APR) on the State’s progress and/or slippage for FFY 2017 is available on the ADE/ESS website under the list titled State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) titled SPP/APR FFY 2017.

The public reporting on the FFY 2017 performance of each public education agency located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan is located on the ADE/ESS website under the list titled State Performance by Indicator. Under each indicator accordion menu is the option to select FFY 2017.

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 website. The ESS special education email 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: <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/monitoring-alerts/>, memoranda pertaining to specific topics, including the SPP/APR, are sent to the ADE/ESS special education email listserv, filed electronically online, and distributed by hard copy through the ESS specialists.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 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 Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State will report the FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) and its progress on implementing the SSIP per the instructions provided.

The attachments from the FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission have been corrected and are posted at this website:

<https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/sppapr/>.

Intro - OSEP Response

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the State did not provide data for Indicator 17. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	61.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	63.34%	64.42%	68.98%	66.40%	67.65%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	75.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,724
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	8,298
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	68.98%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,724	8,298	67.65%	75.60%	68.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

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

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

The Arizona State Board of Education establishes the minimum course of study and competency requirements for graduation from high school through the rulemaking process. The minimum course of study and competency requirements are outlined in Title 7, Chapter 2 of the Arizona Administrative Code. The minimum course of study State Board Rule is R7-2-302.

While the Arizona State Board of Education is charged with prescribing a minimum course of study and corresponding competency requirements, incorporating the academic standards in at least the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies, a PEA's governing board has the flexibility to prescribe a course of study and competency requirements that are consistent with and not less than the course of study and competency requirements that the Arizona State Board of Education prescribes.

The Arizona State Board of Education has established 22 required credits as the minimum number of credits in specified subject areas necessary for high school graduation. For the graduating class of 2017 going forward, students must earn credits in the content areas listed below as determined by the PEA:

- English or English as a Second Language: 4 credits
- Social Studies: 3 credits
- Mathematics: 4 credits
- Science: 3 credits
- The Arts or Career and Technical Education: 1 credit
- Locally prescribed courses: 7 credits

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. A student with a disability is not required to pass the civics test to graduate from high school unless he or she is learning at a level appropriate for the pupil's grade level in a specific academic area and unless a passing score on the statewide assessment or the [civics test] is specifically required in a specific academic area by the pupil's individualized education program, as mutually agreed on by the pupil's parents and the pupil's individualized education program team or the pupil, if the pupil is at least eighteen years of age.

- Passing AzMERIT statewide assessments are not a state requirement for graduation; however, local schools may choose to develop their academic requirements related to the AzMERIT assessment.
- The local governing board of each district or charter school 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)). Students placed in special education, grades 9 through 12, are eligible to receive a high school diploma upon completion of the graduation requirements.
- Algebra II requirement may be modified using a Personal Curriculum, as outlined in R7-2-302.03

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2019 targets set according to the ESSA required long term goals to measure student progress towards graduation. These goals can be found on Arizona's report card site at <https://azreportcards.azed.gov/state-reports> under Long Term Goals and Measure of Interim Progress: Graduation Rate.

COVID-19 did not have an impact on the data reported for Indicator 1, as the data comes from SY 2018-2019.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	28.07%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	28.00%	27.90%	27.80%	27.70%	26.80%
Data	24.09%	25.17%	26.85%	23.46%	21.93%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	25.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,003
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	0
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	18
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,737
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	20

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,737	7,778	21.93%	25.90%	22.33%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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

Arizona uses the same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to describe what counts as dropping out for all youths.

A dropout between the ages of 14 and 21 is defined as an individual who meets all of the following:

- 1) Was publicly enrolled in special education at the start of the reporting period but were not in special education at the end of the reporting year.
- 2) did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - Presumed to be continuing in special education as reported by the public education agency at the end of the year
 - Graduate with a high school diploma
 - Reach the maximum age for special education
 - Died

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 did not have an impact on the data reported for Indicator 2, as the data comes from SY 2018-2019.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	98.50%	Actual	97.44%	93.60%	93.11%	93.85%	96.63%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	98.50%	Actual	98.19%	92.29%	93.18%	93.82%	96.63%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			96.63%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			96.63%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Welcome to Assessments: <https://www.azed.gov/assessment>

Accountability and Research Data: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data>

State Assessment Results: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/state-assessment-results>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

No data available due to an SEA waiver of the ESEA, amended by ESSA, requirements for assessment, accountability, and reporting for the 2019-2020 school year by the USDOE.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	HS											X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2014	Target >=	87.00%	90.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
A	Grade 3	16.80%	Actual	16.80%	18.98%	17.00%	24.54%	17.62%
B	Grade 4	2014	Target >=	87.00%	89.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
B	Grade 4	15.40%	Actual	15.40%	18.49%	18.22%	25.34%	19.52%
C	Grade 5	2014	Target >=	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	96.00%	98.00%
C	Grade 5	10.82%	Actual	10.82%	15.43%	13.95%	30.06%	17.23%
D	Grade 6	2014	Target >=	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
D	Grade 6	9.60%	Actual	9.60%	11.42%	11.03%	24.58%	12.39%
E	Grade 7	2014	Target >=	91.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
E	Grade 7	9.13%	Actual	9.13%	12.87%	11.33%	22.97%	11.85%

F	Grade 8	2014	Target >=	85.00%	88.00%	91.00%	94.00%	97.00%
F	Grade 8	8.84%	Actual	8.84%	9.07%	8.25%	20.57%	9.93%
G	HS	2014	Target >=	88.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%	98.00%
G	HS	16.08%	Actual	16.08%	4.25%	5.80%	20.32%	8.63%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2014	Target >=	83.00%	86.00%	90.00%	93.00%	97.00%
A	Grade 3	19.51%	Actual	19.51%	24.05%	22.13%	46.92%	22.93%
B	Grade 4	2014	Target >=	81.00%	85.00%	89.00%	92.00%	96.00%
B	Grade 4	16.70%	Actual	16.70%	19.35%	19.32%	40.44%	20.13%
C	Grade 5	2014	Target >=	80.00%	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
C	Grade 5	14.60%	Actual	14.60%	17.72%	17.61%	36.43%	17.07%
D	Grade 6	2014	Target >=	78.00%	83.00%	87.00%	91.00%	96.00%
D	Grade 6	10.03%	Actual	10.03%	13.09%	12.31%	26.65%	12.99%
E	Grade 7	2014	Target >=	79.00%	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
E	Grade 7	9.56%	Actual	9.56%	11.13%	9.43%	19.76%	11.06%
F	Grade 8	2014	Target >=	76.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	9.44%	Actual	9.44%	11.35%	9.74%	19.24%	10.91%
G	HS	2014	Target >=	79.00%	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
G	HS	9.29%	Actual	9.29%	3.60%	7.37%	22.31%	9.16%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	34.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	35.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	32.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	29.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	29.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	27.00%
Reading	G >=	HS	26.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 3	38.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	35.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	33.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	29.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	27.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	27.00%
Math	G >=	HS	27.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3			17.62%	34.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 4			19.52%	35.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade 5			17.23%	32.00%		N/A	N/A
D	Grade 6			12.39%	29.00%		N/A	N/A
E	Grade 7			11.85%	29.00%		N/A	N/A
F	Grade 8			9.93%	27.00%		N/A	N/A
G	HS			8.63%	26.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3			22.93%	38.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 4			20.13%	35.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade 5			17.07%	33.00%		N/A	N/A
D	Grade 6			12.99%	29.00%		N/A	N/A
E	Grade 7			11.06%	27.00%		N/A	N/A
F	Grade 8			10.91%	27.00%		N/A	N/A
G	HS			9.16%	27.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Welcome to Assessments: <https://www.azed.gov/assessment>
 Accountability and Research Data: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data>
 State Assessment Results: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/state-assessment-results>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

No data available due to an SEA waiver of the ESEA, amended by ESSA, requirements for assessment, accountability, and reporting for the 2019-2020 school year by the USDOE.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.46%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.46%	0.00%	19.44%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019-2020 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 of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning 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.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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.

643

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
9	29	19.44%	0.00%	31.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The slippage was a result of two factors: Arizona is reinforcing standardization and enforcement of special education discipline reporting beginning in SY 2018–2019, which is the data for the reporting year. This has become necessary because the SEA does not mandate general education discipline data reporting and the number of public education agencies (PEAs) meeting the n-size threshold for the greater than 10-day threshold is decreasing in the state. Based on this standardization, ADE/ESS is producing guidance for PEAs and developing enforcement strategies to support the collection of accurate discipline data reports that include all disciplinary incidents.

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona defines significant discrepancy as any PEA with a suspension/expulsion rate ratio for children with disabilities that is 3.0 or greater.

The following calculation method is used: Rate ratio method. Rate ratio = district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities ÷ State-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities.

The bar at which significant discrepancy is identified: 3.0 (or 3 times as likely) and above

The minimum cell and/or n-size: Minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30 & Minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 did not have an impact on the data reported for Indicator 4a, as the data comes from SY 2018-2019.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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 9 PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. The State has reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of the identified PEAs 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 required the identified PEAs to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with all regulatory requirements before having Part B IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. The PEAs were required to resubmit the discipline policies and procedures for review by ESS program specialists to determine if the PEAs were in alignment with the requirements of 30 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536. The PEAs reviewed their practices via self-assessment and specifically conducted an assessment of the PEA's discipline practices—a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State's monitoring forms. ADE/ESS specialists conducted on-site visits and/or desk audits during the self-assessment to validate the decisions made by the PEAs during the reviews.

Upon completion of the reviews, Arizona determined whether the PEAs complied with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

None of the identified PEAs had policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that in FFY 2018 the number of districts was 672 and in FFY 2019 the number of districts is 673. However, the number of districts reported in the denominator does not match either the FFY 2018 or the FFY 2019 data reported. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

OSEP notes that, in its 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 referenced an incorrect regulatory citation (30 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536).

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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.

654

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	18	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona defines significant discrepancy as any PEA with a suspension/expulsion rate ratio for children with disabilities that are 3.0 or greater among PEAs within the State by race/ethnicity.

The following calculation method is used: Rate ratio method. Rate ratio = district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities by race/ethnicity ÷ suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities of all other groups. If the comparison group is not large enough, the ratio will use the state's rate of suspension/expulsion for children with disabilities of all other groups.

The bar at which significant discrepancy is identified: 3.0 (or 3 times as likely) and above

The minimum cell and/or n-size: Minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30 & Minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 did not have an impact on the data reported for Indicator 4b, as the data comes from SY 2018-2019.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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 6 PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. The State has reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of the identified PEAs 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 required each identified PEA to have special education policies and procedures in compliance with all regulatory requirements before having Part B IDEA Basic Entitlement Grant funds approved by the ADE/ESS. The PEA was required to resubmit the discipline policies and procedures for review by ESS program specialists to determine if the PEA was in alignment with the requirements of 30 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536. The PEA reviewed its practices via self-assessment and specifically conducted an assessment of the PEA's discipline practices—a series of questions requiring narrative responses and a review of student files using the State's monitoring forms. ADE/ESS specialists 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 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 identified PEAs did not have policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that in FFY 2018 the number of districts was 672 and in FFY 2019 the number of districts is 673. However, the number of districts reported in the denominator does not match either the FFY 2018 or the FFY 2019 data reported.

OSEP notes that, in its 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 referenced an incorrect regulatory citation (30 CFR § 300.530 through § 300.536).

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%
A	68.03%	Data	63.65%	64.94%	65.76%	66.57%	66.93%
B	2019	Target <=	15.00%	15.00%	14.90%	14.70%	14.50%
B	13.69%	Data	14.75%	14.76%	14.74%	14.19%	14.00%
C	2018	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	1.90%
C	2.52%	Data	2.06%	2.11%	1.99%	2.33%	2.48%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	67.00%
Target B <=	13.90%
Target C <=	1.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	137,569

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	93,589
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18,831
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	3,037
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	112
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	315

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	93,589	137,569	66.93%	67.00%	68.03%	Met Target	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18,831	137,569	14.00%	13.90%	13.69%	Met Target	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [<i>c1+c2+c3</i>]	3,464	137,569	2.48%	1.90%	2.52%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 was not a factor for this Indicator as the EDFacts file contained data validated on October 1, 2019.

In order to compensate for inclusion of 5-year-old kindergarten children in this Indicator, the FFY 2019 data [A] 68.03%; B) 13.69%; C) 2.52%] is considered a baseline.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data

source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the State's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator. However, the State must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019 data.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	50.00%	50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%
A	30.23%	Data	51.82%	51.36%	51.36%	54.09%	54.75%
B	2019	Target <=	44.80%	44.60%	44.40%	44.20%	44.00%
B	60.42%	Data	41.95%	42.36%	42.22%	39.93%	38.80%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	55.00%
Target B <=	38.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019-2020 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	10,552

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	3,190
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	6,332
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	43
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,190	10,552	54.75%	55.00%	30.23%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,375	10,552	38.80%	38.60%	60.42%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 was not a factor for this Indicator as the EDFacts file contained data validated on October 1, 2019.

In order to compensate for inclusion of 5-year-old kindergarten children in Indicator 5, the FFY 2019 data [A] 30.23%; B) 60.42] is considered a baseline

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the State's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator. However, the State must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019 data.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2017	Target >=	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%
A1	67.93%	Data	78.74%	78.66%	79.01%	67.93%	65.86%
A2	2017	Target >=	63.30%	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%

A2	50.36%	Data	60.07%	58.59%	60.31%	50.36%	49.77%
B1	2017	Target >=	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%
B1	67.20%	Data	77.68%	79.21%	78.55%	67.20%	69.73%
B2	2017	Target >=	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%
B2	48.88%	Data	59.32%	59.07%	59.36%	48.88%	50.08%
C1	2017	Target >=	76.20%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%
C1	56.26%	Data	74.35%	70.68%	78.69%	56.26%	63.93%
C2	2017	Target >=	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	69.00%
C2	42.64%	Data	63.33%	60.07%	80.86%	42.64%	43.60%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	82.50%
Target A2 >=	65.50%
Target B1 >=	81.50%
Target B2 >=	64.50%
Target C1 >=	78.50%
Target C2 >=	69.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,243

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	452	10.65%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	861	20.29%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,107	26.09%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,147	27.03%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	676	15.93%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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	2,254	3,567	65.86%	82.50%	63.19%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,823	4,243	49.77%	65.50%	42.96%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	506	11.93%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	927	21.85%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,093	25.76%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,175	27.69%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	542	12.77%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,268	3,701	69.73%	81.50%	61.28%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,717	4,243	50.08%	64.50%	40.47%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	549	12.94%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	855	20.15%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,272	29.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,095	25.81%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	472	11.12%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,367	3,771	63.93%	78.50%	62.77%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,567	4,243	43.60%	69.50%	36.93%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Due to COVID-19, the child outcomes data collection assessment time frame was shortened by almost 3 months (August through March as opposed to August through June), a critically important time in the course of a preschool-age child's education, and as a result, less growth/progress was able to be demonstrated as captured by the assessment because it ended in March instead of June. There was less slippage in Summary Score 1, where children are approaching age-level expectations, than in Summary Score 2, where children are expected to meet age-level expectations. This also reflects less opportunity to demonstrate age level expectations.</p> <p>In addition, 14% fewer children were represented in the total number of students due to school closure, as the assessment period requirement of six months was not able to be met.</p> <p>In terms of declines around children's social-emotional skills, differences reviewed between current- and prior-year data for each outcome area reflects that social-emotional skills were the second most impacted of the three outcomes areas. State-level activities now include building PEA awareness of APR results including state averages and targets, comparisons of district performance to state averages, and targets; inquiries to schools about curriculum use and implementation of instruction to address social emotional skills; and guidance on ongoing progress monitoring activities to ensure evidence about children's performance is being collected regularly.</p>
A2	<p>Due to COVID-19, the child outcomes data collection assessment time frame was shortened by 3 months (August through March as opposed to August through June), a critically important time in the course of a preschool-age child's education, and as a result, less growth/progress was able to be demonstrated as captured by schools/teachers/assessment methods.</p> <p>In addition, 14% fewer children were represented in the total number of students due to school closure as the assessment period requirement of six months was not able to be met.</p>
B1	<p>Due to COVID-19, the child outcomes data collection assessment time frame was shortened by almost 3 months (August through March as opposed to August through June), a critically important time in the course of a preschool-age child's education, and as a result, less growth/progress was able to be demonstrated as captured by the assessment for ending in March instead of June. There was less slippage in Summary Score 1, where children are approaching age-level expectations, than in Summary Score 2, where children are expected to meet age-level expectations. This also reflects less opportunity to demonstrate age level expectations.</p> <p>In addition, 14% fewer children were represented in the total number of students due to school closure as the assessment period requirement of six months was not able to be met.</p> <p>Differences between current- and prior-year data for each outcome area reflects declines in children's knowledge and skills, the most significantly impacted outcome area this year. Input from PEA administrators and state staff attribute progress declines due to losses of instructional time during school closures. Knowledge and Skills instructional activities are more heavily addressed toward the end of the school year. When schools closed abruptly in March of 2020, it was just prior to or during the spring break for most school districts. Unable to anticipate how long closures would continue, schools were required to submit year-end data in March rather than in June. Upon review of checkpoints for prior year data (FFY18), preschool-aged children with disabilities were on track for FFY19 to have improved results. More children were meeting or exceeding age-level expectations until the school closure caused the school year to end abruptly. State-level activities now include building PEA awareness of APR results including such topics as Child Outcomes state averages and targets, comparisons of district performance to state averages through regular statewide and school district meetings, and guidance to conduct observations and documentation regularly to avoid catch-up activities prior to data collection checkpoints.</p>
B2	<p>Due to COVID-19, the child outcomes data collection assessment time frame was shortened by 3 months (August through March as opposed to August through June), a critically important time in the course of a preschool-age child's education, and as a result, less growth/progress was able to be demonstrated as captured by schools/teachers/assessment methods.</p> <p>In addition, 14% fewer children were represented in the total number of students due to school closure as the assessment period requirement of six months was not able to be met.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C1	<p>Due to COVID-19, the child outcomes data collection assessment time frame was shortened by 3 months (August through March as opposed to August through June), a critically important time in the course of a preschool-age child's education, and as a result, less growth/progress was able to be demonstrated as captured by schools/teachers/assessment methods. There was less slippage in Summary Score 1, where children are approaching age-level expectations, than in Summary Score 2, where children are expected to meet age-level expectations. This also reflects less opportunity to demonstrate age-level expectations.</p> <p>In addition, 14% fewer children were represented in the total number of students due to school closure as the assessment period requirement of six months was not able to be met.</p> <p>The Ability to Meet Needs category was less impacted than other outcomes areas. Schools report that instructional activities are focused on self-sufficiency and social-emotional skills during the early parts of the school year and shift toward knowledge and skills emphasis at the end of the school year. For this reason, emphasis on these skills enable children to make more progress than on the knowledge and skills section.</p>
C2	<p>Due to COVID-19, the child outcomes data collection assessment time frame was shortened by 3 months (August through March as opposed to August through June), a critically important time in the course of a preschool-age child's education, and as a result, less growth/progress was able to be demonstrated as captured by schools/teachers/assessment methods.</p> <p>In addition, 14% fewer children were represented in the total number of students due to school closure as the assessment period requirement of six months was not able to be met.</p>

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/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

The Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) assessment system has been externally validated for use as a formative, developmental, and criterion-referenced assessment. The platform utilizes teacher documentation and ratings of children's performance to reflect their performance based on widely held expectations (i.e., the criterion-referenced measure) of children's skills developed by panels of experts using the latest developmental theory and research. Widely held expectations are the range of knowledge, skills, and abilities that children would be expected to demonstrate for each domain, objective, and dimension over a school year period. Teachers rate children's performance on learning objectives and are given the child's developmental performance. TSG translates the range of possible selections into COS process scores of 1-7 used for entry and exit data. A score of 6 or 7 is defined as functioning comparably to same-aged peers.

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

The currently identified tool used to collect, house, and generate Preschool Child Outcomes data is Teaching Strategies Gold. Upon enrollment in a school district, each child with a disability is to have an electronic portfolio into which teachers document the child's performance of progress through observational notes, photos, and videos. Teachers are required to score students at three separate times during the school year (checkpoints) by assigning levels of performance relative to each piece of documentation gathered for each of the learning domains, such as social-emotional skills, literacy, language, mathematics, science, and self-help skills. This data is used for the Child Outcomes Summary to represent the percentage of children demonstrating age level expectations resulting from special education services and programming. Early Childhood Special Education state staff review documentation status to support PEAs to completion of checkpoints and to ensure that all data for children who leave special education and transition to Kindergarten will be included in the outcomes data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID-19, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated closure of programs that provided services to preschool-aged children with disabilities on March 13, 2020, two months early. A decision was made to have programs use the data collected between the February checkpoint and the March closure date for the exit data for the school year. Children typically demonstrate a great deal of growth in the final months of the school year and as a result, this progress was not able to be captured. Significant reductions in performance levels (1-10%) are noted in each of the outcomes areas and summary statements compared to the previous year. Another potential impact could be from the reduced number of data points (fewer children exited) due to the COVID-19 closures—teachers were unable to complete the activities required to exit the children (prior year=4844; this year=4243).

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2019 data represent slippage from the FFY 2018 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2019 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

The State did not provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same age peers", as required by the measurement table. Additionally, the State did not provide sufficient information to describe the procedures used to gather the data for this indicator.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

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 as 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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	44.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%
Data	85.51%	92.05%	85.22%	92.84%	92.87%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	67.00%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
15,166	16,300	92.87%	67.00%	93.04%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

147,247

Percentage of respondent parents

11.07%

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

Every parent who has a child with an IEP has the opportunity to complete the survey using the web-based data collection system. Thus, a census of parents, of both preschool and school-aged children, 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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If 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 and ongoing technical assistance to PEAs by providing every special education director with detailed survey instructions and sample parent instruction letters to involve all parents who have a child with a disability, aged preschool through high school. The Parent Involvement Survey Coordinator offers PEA staff extensive and ongoing technical assistance to maximize parental responses and involvement rates. Ongoing technical assistance is also available for families, if requested. Collaborations with Raising Special Kids, the State’s Parent Training and Information Center, include consistent notices in their weekly memos and family support specialists’ parent consultations and trainings.

Data analysis of respondents’ race/ethnicity and child age confirmed that results are representative of the state special education population with slightly lower representation for Black or African-American, Hispanic/Latino (Table 8.1), and for students in age group 14-22 (Table 8.2), which is discussed with the attached tables.

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

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 (4.42%) and Hispanic Latino (43.28%) are lower than the State special education population data of 6.22% and 45.84%, respectively. It is possible that the responses in these categories were influenced by respondents from small and/or rural PEAs servicing this 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 technical assistance (TA) in this area of concern in order to increase the response rates for Black African American and Hispanic Latino parents.

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

Table 8.2 shows that 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. This is a continuing area of TA from ADE/ESS.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collected regularly throughout the November–May survey period showed a noteworthy rise in parent participation after the date in mid-March when Arizona schools began online instruction due to COVID-19. When the SY 2019-2020 parent response rates were compared to SY 20-8-2019 during that time period, the increase greater than a 1% gain (SY 19—10.02% compared to SY 20—11.07%). A significant number of parent comments logged in April and May indicated that families were pleased with meaningful messages from teachers and related service providers. Phone, email, and new contact systems improved communication about student learning and behavior. Similar to the increased parent response rate, the Indicator 8 measurement was slightly higher in SY 2019-2020 (93.04%) than the previous year (92.87%).

The ESS data collection system was not adversely impacted by COVID-19. The survey application allowed staff to monitor agency and family

participation to ensure progress was not interrupted. Survey supervision was intensified to encourage school staff and families to focus on the positive impact of family engagement and importance of parental feedback through survey responses.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, 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 as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

162

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	508	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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).

1. The following calculation method is used:
 - a. Risk Ratio method
 - b. Alternate Risk Ratio method: used for any PEA that does not meet the minimum cell size or minimum n-size. 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.
2. The threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified
3.0 and above
3. The number of years of data used in the calculation
3 years
4. The minimum cell and/or n-size
Minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30
Minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

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 ensures that public education agencies' (PEA) 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 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 before having Part B IDEA Entitlement Grant funds approved by the Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ESS). ESS/Program Support & Monitoring reviews PEA policies and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the six-year 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.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices: If a PEA is flagged with disproportionate representation, an investigation of the practices is required to determine whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

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

Upon completion of the self-assessments, the PEA has the option to begin immediate revision to the policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility, and to correct any noncompliance. If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This indicator was not affected by COVID-19, as the data pulled for student demographics were taken before COVID-19 was an issue for Arizona.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that 508 districts met the minimum n size requirement and 162 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum n size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum n size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2019 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "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).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, 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 excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

290

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
22	0	380	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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).

1. The following calculation method is used:
 - a. Risk Ratio method
 - b. Alternate Risk Ratio method: used for any PEA that does not meet the minimum cell size or minimum n-size. 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.
2. The threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified
3.0 and above
3. The number of years of data used in the calculation
3 years
4. The minimum cell and/or n-size
Minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30
Minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

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 ensures that public education agencies' (PEA) 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 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 before having Part B IDEA Entitlement Grant funds approved by the Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ESS). ESS/Program Support & Monitoring reviews PEA policies and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the six-year 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.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices: If a PEA is flagged with disproportionate representation, an investigation of the practices is required to determine whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification.

If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, then the PEA, with support of ESS program specialists, conduct the following:

- An ADE/ESS specialist reviews current monitoring data, if applicable.
- Validation of the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.
- 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.

Upon completion of the self-assessments, the PEA can begin immediate revision to the policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, evaluation, and eligibility, and to correct any noncompliance.

If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, 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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This indicator was not affected by COVID-19, as the data pulled for student demographics were taken before COVID-19 was an issue for Arizona.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that 380 districts met the minimum n size requirement and 268 districts did not meet the minimum n size requirement and were excluded from the calculation. The number of districts excluded from the calculation because they do not meet the minimum n size, plus the number of districts that met the State-established minimum n size, do not equal the total number of districts the State reported in the FFY 2019 Introduction. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	86.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.60%	99.82%	94.63%	97.29%	97.69%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,061	1,036	97.69%	100%	97.64%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

25

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 2019 Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidents of noncompliance: 25

Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 2/1/2021: 25

Range of days beyond the timeline: 2-173

Range of days:

Mean: 13.57

Median: 22

Mode: 4 – 4 Occurrences

Reasons for the delays included

- unavailability of student* (absences, illness, etc.) (1)
- miscalculation of 60-day timeline (2)
- unavailability of required personnel (parent, general education teacher, etc.) (2)
- lack of understanding of the evaluation process (8)
- Lack of tracking system to alert the PEA to the timeline (2)
- Shortage of evaluators (2)
- Interruption in school calendar (3)
- Scheduling difficulty with parents (4)

The reason for the longest delay (173 days) was a lack of tracking system to alert the PEA to the timeline.

* 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 established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Per Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) R7-2-401(E)(5), the 60-day evaluation period may be extended for an additional 30 days provided it is in the best interest of the child and the parent and PEA agree in writing to such an extension. Neither the 60-day evaluation period nor any extension shall cause a reevaluation to exceed the timelines for a reevaluation within three years of the previous evaluation.

The SEA considers a written agreement of extension to be compliant with the required timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted. All cases that fall within these parameters would be considered completed on time and there would be no reason collected for delay.

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

State monitoring

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. The PEAs were selected based on cycle year, as a result of a score on the risk analysis tool, 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 Indicator 11, in conjunction with verification by the SEA.

Data Collection

Data are collected from the selected PEAs during the State's differentiated monitoring system based on their cycle year data, use of a risk assessment tool, and other factors as described above.

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 2019 (SY 2019–2020) and for whom initial evaluations included eligibility determinations and were completed during FFY 2019 (SY 2019–2020).

In March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the school year. Due to this school closure, some adjustments were made to the differentiated monitoring system. These adjustments included the following: extending timelines for submission of data, SEA verification of data at a later date, and movement of a small number of PEAs (5) to a different monitoring cycle year. The impact of these adjustments, on data collected, is negligible since the monitoring activities were still conducted with the same system and integrity of that system was intact.

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/Program Support and Monitoring (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/PSM specialists validate and verify the data through on-site visits or desk audits.

In December 2019, OSEP issued guidance on reporting instances of noncompliance in the APR, including those that may not meet the SEA definition of a finding. Based on this, Arizona has adjusted their reporting to ensure all instances of noncompliance, including those not meeting the definition of a finding as defined by the SEA monitoring system. This adjustment has resulted in an increase in the instances of noncompliance, as the SEA definition of a finding applies to noncompliance at the completion of differentiated monitoring activities. In some differentiated monitoring activities, there was opportunity for PEA correction of noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding by the SEA. These data were not previously captured, as prior to the OSEP clarification, Arizona reported data in accordance with the SEA definition of a finding. Arizona now reports in accordance with OSEP guidance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Establishment of 60-Day 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 interest of the child and the parents and the PEA agree in writing to do so (A.A.C. R7-2-401 (E)(4)).

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2019

During FFY 2019, 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.

Due to COVID-19 in March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the school year. Due to this school closure, some adjustments were made to the differentiated monitoring system. These adjustments included extending timelines for submission of data, SEA verification of data at a later date, and movement of a small number of PEAs (5) to a different monitoring cycle year. The impact of these adjustments on data collected is negligible since the monitoring activities were still conducted with the same system and integrity of that system was intact. ADE/ESS issued guidance throughout this mandated closure, reinforcing the requirements of the state programmatic monitoring system.

The corrective action process was minimally impacted throughout this closure. Some impacts were PEA inability to provide evidence of correction, and inability of PEAs to access student files. Given Arizona's differentiated monitoring system and the 60-day timeline for correction of this item, timely individual correction was not impacted. During this mandated closure, ADE/ESS issued guidance to PEAs about the timelines and requirements of the state programmatic monitoring system, specifically correction of noncompliance. ADE/ESS continued to utilize enforcement strategies when needed in instances where the PEA was not making adequate progress toward correction of noncompliance and/or timelines.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The ESS/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) *.

In response to a request for clarification from OSEP, all noncompliance from FFY 2018 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

* 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 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 evaluations.

In response to a request for clarification from OSEP, all noncompliance from FFY 2018 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

In March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the 2019– 2020 school year. Due to this school closure, some adjustments were made to the differentiated monitoring system. The corrective action process described above was minimally impacted through this closure. Some impacts were: PEA inability to provide evidence of correction, inability of PEAs to access student files. Given Arizona's differentiated monitoring system, and the 60 -day timeline for correction of this item, timely individual correction was not impacted.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

The State selected the radio button to indicate that it uses the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted. Additionally, in its narrative, the State reported "[t]he 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 interest of the child and the parents and the PEA agree in writing to do so (A.A.C. R7-2-401 (E)(4))." Therefore, the State should select the appropriate radio button to indicate that it uses a State-established timeline.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # 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.

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.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	63.61%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.57%	99.08%	99.07%	98.78%	99.27%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,342
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	338

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,804
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	83
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	11
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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	2,804	2,910	99.27%	100%	96.36%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage has been identified for Early Childhood Transition. Percent decline from prior year was significant (from 99.27% to 96.36%). Procedures put in place to prevent slippage and improve results through ongoing technical assistance were implemented in prior years and improved outcomes were realized from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018. Technical assistance continued during FFY 2019, as SEA notifications and alerts were tracked, analyzed, and addressed through collaborative meetings between PEAs and IDEA Part C agency staff. It was anticipated that improved results would continue.

However, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted Early Childhood Transition activities in the last three months of FFY 2019. In March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the school year. During this time, most PEAs initially stopped all education-related activity as they transitioned from in-person to online instruction. ADE/ESS provided prompt and thorough explanations of responsibilities through memos, alerts, notices, virtual meetings, web-based presentations, and website guidance between March and June 2020. While most PEAs were responsive, some schools failed to heed the guidance regarding the obligation to perform early childhood transition activities during the closure, including conferences, evaluations, and IEP meetings with families. As a result, ADE/ESS learned that some PEAs (perhaps anticipating a federal waiver of transition timelines/activities) did not follow through to complete transition activities in a timely manner. Factoring out the impact of COVID-19 on Early Childhood Transition activities, the State would have observed only a .71% instead of a 2.91% decline in this Indicator.

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

106

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.

Reasons for Delay

Late referral from Part C: 13

Interruption of school schedule: 79

Did not pass vision/hearing: 0

Unknown reasons related to COVID-19: 14

Total = 106

In FFY 2019, a total of 106 children were not transitioned on time due to late referrals from the Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) (13), interruption of school schedule (79), or for unknown reasons related to COVID-19 (14). This is compared to a total of 21 in FFY 2018, 30 in FFY 2017, 21 in FFY 2016, 20 in FFY 2019, 9 in FFY 2014, 11 in FFY 2013, 9 in FFY 2012, 21 in FFY 2011, and 39 in FFY 2010. PEAs are asked to submit an alert to the ADE Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) unit 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 birthday). 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.

While ESS is determining reasons for students identified as "Unknown reasons related to COVID-19," it is believed that the reason for delay was most likely due to an interruption in school schedule, unless more specific information can be provided by each PEA.

If a local service-providing agency is reporting difficulty with a PEA, the local agency issues an alert to the State AzEIP office. The ADE/ECSE provides technical assistance and follow-up to the PEA. The ADE/ECSE and AzEIP share data to track the resolution of the difficulties indicated on the alerts. Challenges with the completion of the 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 to facilitate collaborative efforts between Head Start organizations, PEAs, and Part C agencies. This has helped Part C service coordinators to encourage families to have regular hearing and vision screenings.

Range of days Beyond the Third Birthday

Range of Days: 2 to 72 days

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

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 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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

Data Collection

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

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ECSE unit and ADE/Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) specialists assure the validity and reliability of the data as it is collected, maintained, and reported using internal edit checks. Training is provided to school personnel by the ESS Data Management unit regarding the operation of the data system and interpretation of the questions that are components of the measurement. The State requires an assurance from 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 based on the PEA's self-reported submission in the Web-based data collection system. When a PEA self-reports noncompliance, the SEA verifies correction of all self-reported noncompliance.

FFY 2019 Noncompliance

Number of findings of PEA self-reported noncompliance: 106

Number of findings of PEA self-reported noncompliance corrected prior to one-year timeline of 8/01/2021 (verified corrected as of 2/1/21): 51

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted Early Childhood Transition activities in the last three months of FFY 2019. In March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the school year. During this time, most PEAs initially stopped all education-related activity as they transitioned from in-person to online instruction. ADE/ESS provided prompt and thorough explanations of responsibilities through memos, alerts, notices, virtual meetings, web-based presentations, and website guidance between March and June 2020. While most PEAs were responsive, some schools failed to heed the guidance regarding the obligation to perform early childhood transition activities during the closure, including conferences, evaluations, and IEP meetings with families. As a result, ADE/ESS learned that some PEAs (perhaps anticipating a federal waiver of transition timelines/activities) did not follow through to complete transition activities in a timely manner. Factoring out the impact of COVID-19 on Early Childhood Transition activities, the State would have observed only a .71% instead of a 2.91% decline in this Indicator.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21	0	0

FFY 2018 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 FFY 2018 SPP/APR response, Arizona verified that each PEA with noncompliance was reflected in the data:

• All instances of non-compliance 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 is 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 submits In-by-3 policies and procedures for review and feedback

2. 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 PWN for those children found ineligible for special education.

In response to a request for clarification from OSEP, all noncompliance from FFY 2018 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists, in conjunction with ADE/ESS Early Childhood Special Education specialists, through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

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 PEA's early intervention transitions, including those that were collaboratively developed and agreed upon with AZEIP service coordinators.

• The ADE/ECSE specialists and PSM 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.

In response to a request for clarification from OSEP, all noncompliance from FFY 2018 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances

of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists, in conjunction with ADE/ESS Early Childhood Special Education specialists, through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	90.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.38%	97.39%	85.61%	83.96%	81.97%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
380	487	81.97%	100%	78.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In December 2019, OSEP issued guidance on reporting instances of noncompliance in the APR, including those that may not meet the SEA definition of a finding. Based on this, Arizona has adjusted its reporting to ensure all instances of noncompliance, including those not meeting the definition of a finding as defined by the SEA monitoring system. This adjustment has resulted in an increase in the instances of noncompliance as the SEA definition of a finding applies to noncompliance at the completion of differentiated monitoring activities. In some differentiated monitoring activities, there was opportunity for PEA correction of noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding by the SEA. These data were not previously captured, as prior to the OSEP clarification, Arizona reported data in accordance with the SEA definition of a finding. Arizona now reports in accordance with OSEP guidance. For FFY 2019, if Arizona were still reporting noncompliance based solely on the state definition of a finding, the percentage of compliance would be 81.52%, commensurate with the prior year reporting. Slippage is due to the adjustment required to report data in accordance with the OSEP guidance issued in 2019.

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

State monitoring

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 2019 Findings of Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidence of noncompliance: 107

Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 2/1/2021:

Arizona made 107 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, 94 findings have been corrected as of 2/1/2021

Data Source

The data for Indicator 13 are from the Arizona monitoring system. Beginning in FFY 2016, the monitoring system began selecting public education agencies (PEAs) for monitoring on a cycle basis and differentiating the activities based on a risk analysis tool, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution, audit findings, and annual determination. Both the reported number of youths with IEPs, aged 16 and above, and the number of youths, aged 16 and above, with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition reflect a difference in the number of files reviewed each year by the Arizona monitoring system. Each year is a different cohort of PEAs, and some PEAs may be elementary only, where secondary transition would not be part of a sample.

The National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) 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 through the State’s differentiated monitoring system based on their cycle year data, use of a risk assessment tool, and other factors as described above.

In March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the 2019-2020 school year. Due to this school closure, some adjustments were made to the differentiated monitoring system. These adjustments included extending timelines for submission of data, SEA verification of data at a later date, and movement of a small number of PEAs (5) to a different monitoring cycle year. The impact of these adjustments on data collected was negligible, since the monitoring activities were still conducted with the same system and the integrity of that system was intact. ADE/ESS issued guidance throughout this mandated closure, reinforcing the requirements of the state programmatic monitoring system.

Valid and Reliable Data

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

In December 2019, OSEP issued guidance on reporting instances of noncompliance in the APR, including those that may not meet the SEA definition of a finding. Based on this guidance, Arizona has adjusted its reporting to ensure all instances of noncompliance, including those not meeting the definition of a finding as defined by the SEA monitoring system. This adjustment has resulted in an increase in the instances of noncompliance as the SEA definition of a finding applies to noncompliance at the completion of differentiated monitoring activities. In some differentiated monitoring activities, there was opportunity for PEA correction of noncompliance prior to the issuance of a finding by the SEA. These data were not previously captured, as prior to the OSEP clarification, Arizona reported data in accordance with the SEA definition of a finding. Arizona now reports in accordance with OSEP guidance.

Definition of Findings for Monitoring for FFY 2019

During FFY 2019, a finding for Indicator 13 was issued when the line item for secondary transition was found to be noncompliant. The finding was a written notification to the PEA by the State that the line item was noncompliant, and the finding included a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. The source of information on which to base a finding of noncompliance is an individual student file.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In March 2020, the Governor of Arizona ordered a state-mandated school closure, which continued through the end of the 2019-2020 school year. Due to this school closure, some adjustments were made to the differentiated monitoring system. These adjustments included extending timelines for submission of data, SEA verification of data at a later date, and movement of a small number of PEAs (5) to a different monitoring cycle year. The

impact of these adjustments on data collected is negligible, since the monitoring activities were still conducted with the same system and the integrity of that system was intact. ADE/ESS issued guidance throughout this mandated closure, reinforcing the requirements of the state programmatic monitoring system.

The corrective action process was minimally impacted throughout the Governor-mandated school closure. Some impacts were PEA inability to provide evidence of correction and inability of PEAs to access student files. Given Arizona's differentiated monitoring system and the 60-day timeline for correction of this item, timely individual correction was not impacted. During this mandated closure, ADE/ESS issued guidance to PEAs about the timelines and requirements of the state programmatic monitoring system, specifically correction of noncompliance. ADE/ESS continued to utilize enforcement strategies when needed in instances where the PEA was not making adequate progress toward correction of noncompliance and/or timelines.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
55	55	0	0

FFY 2018 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 Program Support and Monitoring (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, 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).

In response to a request for clarification from OSEP, all noncompliance from FFY 2018 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

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, within 60 calendar days from the date of written notification of noncompliance 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).

In response to a request for clarification from OSEP, all noncompliance from FFY 2018 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

The corrective action process was minimally impacted throughout the Governor-mandated school closure in March 2020 through the 2019-2020 school year due to COVID-19. Some impacts were PEA inability to provide evidence of correction and inability of PEAs to access student files. Given Arizona's differentiated monitoring system and the 60-day timeline for correction of this item, timely individual correction was not impacted. During this mandated closure, ADE/ESS issued guidance to PEAs about the timelines and requirements of the state programmatic monitoring system, specifically correction of noncompliance. ADE/ESS continued to utilize enforcement strategies when needed in instances where the PEA was not making adequate progress toward correction of noncompliance and/or timelines.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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: States 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.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

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. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2018	Target >=	28.10%	29.60%	31.10%	32.60%	34.10%
A	23.80%	Data	23.09%	22.36%	22.79%	21.51%	23.80%
B	2018	Target >=	62.20%	64.20%	66.20%	68.20%	70.20%
B	54.56%	Data	58.74%	61.34%	63.55%	61.17%	54.56%
C	2018	Target >=	75.40%	76.70%	78.00%	79.30%	80.60%
C	73.72%	Data	73.51%	74.98%	77.66%	75.27%	73.72%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	24.30%
Target B >=	56.50%
Target C >=	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

FFY 2019 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	6,660
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,459
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,227
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)	537
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).	606

Measure	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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,459	6,660	23.80%	24.30%	21.91%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3,686	6,660	54.56%	56.50%	55.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
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)	4,829	6,660	73.72%	75.00%	72.51%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	A possible contributing factor for this slippage may be the shift of most higher education institutions to remote learning in March 2020 due to COVID-19. This shift may have impacted youth with disabilities 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, which may have also been further impacted by a switch to a remote learning setting.
C	In addition to the explanations provided above, a possible contributing factor to C slippage 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 contributing factor due to COVID-19 is that opportunities for obtaining and retaining employment and enrolling in school or job training programs were limited. Youth with disabilities who required education/training or employment support services may have lost access or experienced a disruption in their services due to COVID-19. Finally, a possible contribution for slippage in all areas could be the challenges for youth with disabilities in finding reliable transportation to employment, school, or other training opportunities as well as accessing reliable technology with Internet connectivity to work or train remotely.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State’s analyses 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.

The ADE/ESS used the Response Calculator developed by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transitions (NTACT) to calculate the representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of (a) disability type, (b) race/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 2018–2019. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of +/-3% are important. Negative differences indicate an underrepresentation of the group, and positive differences indicate overrepresentation. The State recognizes that the response data for this indicator were not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Respondents were representative of 2018–2019 target leavers based on gender, ethnicity, and category of disability; however, they were not representative of 2018–2019 targeted leavers based on exit status.

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: <http://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/transition/post-school-outcomes/>

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data Source and Collection Methods

During FFY 2019, 281 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, 180 (or 64%) of PEAs that were required to participate in the PSO data collection had ten or fewer leavers while 8% of PEAs had 100 or more leavers. A total of 8,478 youth statewide were eligible to take the PSO Survey during the FFY 2019 data collection period. Of the 281 PEAs required to participate in the PSO Survey, 275 (or 98%) met the requirement. In addition, 177 (or 63%) of PEAs had a response rate of 80% or more of their leavers.

For PEAs to communicate with students about 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, 2020, after they were out of school for at least one year.

Missing Data

Arizona’s PSO response rate for FFY 2019 was 78.6% (8,478 youths eligible for contact and 6,660 respondents). Arizona’s PSO response rate for the FFY 2019 is consistent with prior years, despite COVID-19. However, the FFY 2019 PSO Survey is missing data on 1,818 former students (or 21.44% of the leavers), which is 4.48% higher than FFY 2018 and may indicate an impact of COVID-19. An analysis of missing data indicated that the largest segments of missing data were the result of five factors:

- Schools were not able to contact leavers after three attempts (979 former students or 11.5%)
- Schools did not have correct contact information for leavers (448 former students or 5.3%)
- Schools did not collect contact information for leavers (78 former students or 0.9%)
- The respondents refused to participate (298 former students or 3.5%)
- The respondents did not complete the survey (15 former students or 0.2%)

Selection Bias

Respondents to the survey were underrepresentative of the population of youth who dropped out of school. Of those youth who dropped out of school, 45% did not respond to the survey. This is an increase of 38% from FFY 2018, which may indicate an impact of COVID-19 and difficulties contacting these leavers. ADE will continue to work with PEAs to identify strategies to encourage survey responses from youth in the dropout category and ensure that PEAs are collecting contact information while students are still enrolled in school.

Response Rate

The FFY 2019 survey response rate was 6,660 of the 8,478 youths eligible to take the survey, or 78.6% of leavers. The total of youth who were eligible was adjusted for those who had returned to school, were deceased, or whose data were uploaded by the PEA to the system in error.

Covid-19

In April 2020, ADE/ESS held a Post School Outcomes Focus Group meeting to receive stakeholder input about adding an optional COVID-19 question for the survey. This optional question allowed ADE to collect information about the impact of COVID-19 policies on former students’ post school engagement in postsecondary education or training and employment. The PSO Focus Group is composed primarily of special education administrators and teachers from PEAs statewide.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

ADE/ESS provides technical assistance and training to PEAs to support their efforts in reaching out to the population of youths who dropped out of school. ADE/ESS refers to the NTACT guidance document for contacting hard-to-find youths as a resource. ADE/ESS also communicates with PEAs who successfully contact youths who dropped out to create a list of practices and strategies to share statewide during training opportunities.

14 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported the data were representative for all categories except for exit status. Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did describe the strategies to address this issue in the future

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	14
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019–2020 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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	57.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	66.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00% - 78.00%	68.00% - 78.00%
Data	52.38%	59.09%	55.56%	50.00%	75.00%

Targets

FFY	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	68.00%	78.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target (low)	FFY 2019 Target (high)	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6	14	75.00%	68.00%	78.00%	42.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Use of the formal resolution session in Arizona is rare. Most parties waive the resolution session and opt to either settle privately or to utilize mediation. Only a small percentage of hearings go forward in Due Process cases, and in the vast majority of cases, the parties are able to resolve their dispute without a hearing, however the resolution session itself is not the mechanism that the parties are choosing to resolve the dispute. The COVID 19 school closures in Arizona may have impacted the parties use of the resolution session during the period in which the resolution session could only be held virtually.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data provided is complete and accurate and there was no impact on the collection of the data due to COVID 19.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	51
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	24
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	13

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2019-2020 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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	82.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	74.00% - 84.00%	74.00% - 84.00%
Data	62.86%	78.26%	57.50%	77.08%	81.82%

Targets

FFY	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	74.00%	84.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target (low)	FFY 2019 Target (high)	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
24	13	51	81.82%	74.00%	84.00%	72.55%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The mediation agreement rate is likely to fluctuate year-to-year based on several variables. In this reporting year, the variables included the impact of COVID-19 and the switch to virtual mediation platforms. Although virtual mediation is effective, there may have been a learning curve initially that impacted whether the mediation itself resulted in an agreement. As is clear from the historical data, the percentage of mediations that result in an agreement is not linear and does not correlate to the effectiveness of the mediation program itself. Additionally for many cases, although an agreement was not reached in the mediation itself, the mediation session paved the way for a later settlement, making the availability of mediation an effective tool to assist parties in resolving disputes, whether an agreement is reached at the conclusion of the mediation session or at a later date. A decrease in the agreement rate from mediation could also reflect particular characteristics of the parties or the complexity of the issues involved.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data reported is complete and accurate and data collection itself was not impacted by COVID-19.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Alissa Trollinger

Title:

Deputy Associate Superintendent, Exceptional Student Services

Email:

alissa.trollinger@azed.gov

Phone:

602-364-4004

Submitted on:

04/29/21 5:55:24 PM