State of Arizona
Department of Education

Arizona
State Performance Plan
Annual Performance Report
For Special Education
FFY 2015

Highly Effective Schools Division
Exceptional Student Services
1535 W Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007

http://www.azed.gov/

The Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) system of general supervision comprises the following components: Program Support and Monitoring, Dispute Resolution, and Fiscal Monitoring. The general supervision system incorporates the shift to results-driven accountability and provides a balance between compliance and outcomes for students with disabilities. The 2015-2016 school year was Arizona's second year of the Examining Practices monitoring model.

The general supervision system is structured around collaborative conversations and technical assistance. **All schools** were involved in the following activities in the 2015–2016 transition year:

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

During the 2015–2016 school year, ADE reviewed data with local education agencies (LEAs) to determine general supervision activities. ADE/ESS used methods and procedures to carry out general supervision requirements that were consistent but flexible in order to adapt to the varying needs of children, educational settings, and administrative realities. When ADE reviewed data, LEA monitoring schedules were adjusted, and Examining Practices activities were assigned any time data indicated broad issues across systems.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

635

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

Exceptional Student Services Monitoring Model

The Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services (ESS), revised its monitoring system in 2014 to align with the principles of results-driven accountability and provide a more balanced approach in supporting LEAs. The Examining Practices system was revised to increase the focus on data through results-driven accountability with less emphasis being put on procedural compliance. In addition, ADE/ESS is working with LEAs to help them develop their own systems of internal supervision. Examining Practices considers compliance and outcomes in the review of LEA policies and procedures and practices, as well as in conversations about an LEA's own internal supervision system.

The program specialist assigned to the school district or charter school meets with the LEA director each spring to discuss the LEA data to plan for any upcoming Examining Practices activities.

The better the data are across systems, the better an LEA is able to provide quality programs for students with disabilities.

Arizona has found it essential to include LEA staff as active partners with ADE/ESS staff when examining LEA data, but especially when examining LEA practices. Some tasks are completed together, and some tasks are completed by the LEA staff after they receive training from the ESS staff. The LEA must have a team of active participants, which includes LEA special education personnel and a general education representative.

Ongoing technical assistance plays a significant role in the general supervision of LEAs in Arizona. ESS program specialists conduct annual site visits with each assigned LEA to review the LEA's system of internal supervision and its policies, procedures, and practices. Also included are data related to indicators 11 and 13–the targeted indicators. Program specialists provide ongoing technical assistance related to other issues and questions that may arise. Targeted training is available when data indicate a need.

Every year, all LEAs in the state use the Risk Analysis tool to determine which level of support is appropriate for them for that year. The Risk Analysis tool contains several factors that are determinant in an LEA's need for training and professional development in both areas of compliance and results. There are three levels of support: direct, guided, and independent.

Direct Support:

Direct contact with an ESS program specialist who leads the LEAs through the activities and monitors their progress

EDISA Five-Year Cycle, Indicator 11 & Indicator 13 data collected every year

- Year 1: Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement (EDISA)
  - LEAs in EDISA will attend three workshops throughout the school year. Each workshop is held for two days. During the workshop, each team develops a root cause analysis based on school data. The teams then develop Action Plans, outlining which activities will take place over the next year to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Year 2: Implement Action Plan
- Year 3: Qualitative data/reflection/plan for changes or implementation
- Year 4: Progress monitor/plan for changes or implementation
- Year 5: Peer progress monitor

Guided Support:

ESS program specialist guides an LEA team through activities

Based on risk analysis factors

- Data analysis to determine root causes
- Collection of Indicator 11 & Indicator 13 data
- Professional development
- Guide steps training
- Specialist's completion of tracking form

Independent Support:

LEA conducts activities independently with ESS specialist consult

Based on risk analysis factors

- Data review and guiding question analysis
- Indicators 11 and 13 data collection, verified by ESS specialist
- Specialist's completion of tracking form

Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement

(EDISA)

Examining Data to Improve Student Achievement (EDISA) is a collaborative partnership between local education agencies and ADE in a team-training program designed to close achievement gaps between students with special needs and their nondisabled peers. EDISA facilitators and ESS coaches guide district- and building-level data action teams through a Data Use Framework that supports continuous improvement by leading teams to discover causes of the achievement gaps between students and to develop plans to improve outcomes. The focus has been on reading thus far; however, any area can be incorporated into the framework.

This training focuses on eight stages of a comprehensive Data Use Framework. The concept has four phases: preparation, inquiry, planning, and action. The goal of the training is for teams to utilize data to identify the causes of the reading achievement gap between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers and to narrow the gap by increasing positive outcomes in reading achievement for all students.

Team success is evaluated based on the team's application of the Data Use Framework to

1. Identify relevant data that will address a problem or concern;
2. Conduct data analysis and determine actionable causes;
3. Develop measurable outcomes and identify strategic activities;
4. Implement the plan with integrity and evaluate progress.

Enforcement Activities

If an LEA is unable to correct all identified noncompliance within a year from the Written Notification of Findings letter, one or more of the following enforcement actions will be taken, based on the severity of the remaining noncompliance. LEAs are entitled to request a hearing if they wish to challenge the enforcement action(s).

ESS development of a prescribed Action Plan with required activities and timelines to address the continuing noncompliance.

Enforcement of Action Plan activities as outlined in the current agency Action Plan.

Review and revision of the current Action Plan to develop targeted activities that address the continuing noncompliance.

Special monitor selection.

Interruption of IDEA payments until adequate compliance is achieved. For charter schools not receiving IDEA funds, a request for withholding 10% of state funds.

For charter schools, a request to the appropriate board for a notice of intent to revoke the charter.

With the Arizona State Board of Education approval, interruption of Group B weighted state aid or redirection of funds pursuant to 34 C.F.R. §300.222(a).

Request to the attorney general for assistance in law enforcement.

Dispute Resolution

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

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

When both parties to a State administrative complaint agree that a mutually beneficial resolution can be reached without the need for a full investigation, the assigned complaint investigator may assist the parties in reaching an informal resolution. Although no formal resolution agreement is required, if the complaining party indicates that she or he is satisfied with the PEA's response to the complaint, the complaint investigator will issue a withdrawal letter. If the complaining party changes his or her mind about informal resolution and wants the investigation to go forward, the individual may notify the Dispute Resolution office within five business days and the investigation will move forward.

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

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

Incentives, Sanctions, and Enforcement

Incentives Related to Monitoring

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

1. ADE/ESS provided two paid registrations for either the ESS Directors Institute or the Transition Conference for PEAs that demonstrated 100% compliance on Indicators 11 and 13 in a data review monitoring.

2. ADE/ESS gave one paid registration for either the ESS Directors Institute or the Transition Conference to PEAs that had no findings at the completion of the self-assessment monitoring.

Sanctions and Enforcement Related to Monitoring

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

ESS development of a prescribed corrective action plan (CAP) with required activities and timelines to address the continuing noncompliance.

Enforcement of CAP activities as outlined in the current CAP.

Review and revision of the current CAP to develop targeted activities that address the continuing noncompliance.

Assignment of a special monitor.

Interruption of IDEA payments until adequate compliance is achieved. For charter schools not receiving IDEA funds, a request to begin withholding 10% of State funds.

- For charter schools, a request to the appropriate board for a notice of intent to revoke the charter.
- With Arizona State Board of Education approval, interruption of Group B weighted State aid or redirection of funds pursuant to 34 C,F,R, §300.227(a).
- Request to the Arizona Attorney General for legal action.

Sanctions and Enforcement Related to Dispute Resolution

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

Within five business days following the due date specified in the Letter of Findings, the CACM will attempt to informally communicate with the PEA via phone calls and/or emails for the following purpose(s):

- to inquire as to why the corrective action is incomplete and to direct the PEA to immediately submit the completed corrective action documentation;
- to provide feedback on any concerns with the documentation submitted, to give clarification on the requirements, and to direct the PEA to revise and resubmit the corrective action documentation within a specified timeframe; or
- to inquire as to why the corrective action has not been submitted and to direct the PEA to immediately submit the completed corrective action documentation.
- If the delay in submitting the documentation is due to extenuating circumstances and the CACM determines based on those circumstances that it is reasonable to negotiate a new due date for the corrective action to be submitted, the CACM will send a Letter of Understanding, with a copy to the complainant, detailing (a) the CACM's concerns and the PEA's explanation, (b) any decisions made to resolve the problem, and (c) a new negotiated due date.

If the concerns were not resolved using the informal procedures described above, the CACM will send a Letter of Inquiry to the PEA, with a copy provided to the complainant. A Letter of Inquiry may be sent for any of the following reasons:

- The PEA is nonresponsive to the CACM's attempts at informal communication.
- The CACM and the PEA are not able to resolve concerns with the content of corrective action documentation submitted or the PEA's failure to submit all required corrective action documentation through informal communication.
- The CACM is not satisfied with the PEA's response to informal inquiries for reasons such as the PEA does not intend to complete and submit the corrective action, the PEA refuses to make needed changes to corrective action documentation, or the PEA's informal explanation of the circumstances causing the delay in submitting corrective action documentation is unacceptable to the CACM.
- The PEA fails to submit new or revised corrective action documentation within the informally negotiated timeframe or by the new due date set forth in the Letter of Understanding.
- In other cases determined necessary and appropriate by the CACM.
- The PEA must provide a Letter of Explanation to ADE/Dispute Resolution within three business days of receipt of the Letter of Inquiry fully answering the inquiry and explaining the circumstances surrounding the non-submission of or failure to complete the corrective action documentation.
- If the circumstances are acceptable, then the CACM will send a Letter of Understanding, with a copy to the complainant, detailing (a) the CACM's concerns and the PEA's explanation, (b) any decisions made to resolve the problem, and (c) a new negotiated due date. If the circumstances are unacceptable or the PEA does not respond to the Letter of Inquiry as noted above, then the CACM will compose a Letter of Enforcement.

If the corrective action documentation submitted was not completed as specified in the Letter of Findings and following informal communication between the CACM and the PEA, the revised and resubmitted corrective action documentation was not satisfactory, the CACM will inform the PEA via Letter of Clarification, with a copy to the complainant, that the corrective action item in question must be revised. A new due date for the revised corrective action will be assigned in this letter and technical assistance will be offered.

If, after the steps outlined above have been taken, the corrective action documentation received remains incomplete or has not been received by ADE/Dispute Resolution or the corrective action has not been completed as specified in the Letter of Findings, the CACM will send a Letter of Enforcement to the chief administrator of the PEA, with a copy to the special education director or coordinator and the complainant, detailing the corrective action items that are incomplete, the corrective action items that were not completed as specified in the Letter of Findings, or those items that have not been received.

The Letter of Enforcement will outline which of the following enforcement options will be taken:
- Interruption of federal funds
- Redirection of federal funds to ensure the child receives a free appropriate public education (FAPE)
- If applicable, reporting of violations to a sponsoring entity for charter schools and seeking of remedies through the

appropriate board.

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

ESS Fiscal Monitoring

Receiving federal grant monies entails both programmatic and financial duties, which include proper programming and expenditure of monies, goals achievement, and related reporting. Information related to the key areas addressed during the fiscal monitoring of federal funds are:

1. Payroll Expenditure Compliance, including Time and Effort
2. Non Payroll Expenditure Compliance
3. Internal Controls
4. Fixed Asset Compliance—Fixed asset refers to tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition as defined by the district or charter's fixed-asset policy
5. Grants Management Compliance

ADE chooses approximately 200 LEAs per year for fiscal monitoring using a three-year rotational cycle. However, LEAs with a higher risk can be selected any year. The LEAs go through a risk assessment based on the expenditure report provided by the LEAs and internal data gathered by ESS. If there is a high risk indicated on the expenditure report and internal data, certain expenditures are selected as sample items, and the LEA is required to provide supporting documentation for these sample items. If further concerns arise, the LEA will be contacted and an on-site review will be conducted. This process provides a higher level of monitoring than the monitoring that was done previously so that resources can be spent on those LEAs that need assistance.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

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

The following training opportunities were offered to teaching professionals to meet specific professional development needs in Arizona:

School-Wide Information System (SWIS) Training

July 6 & 8, 2015, Florence Unified School District

July 13, 2015, Mohave Valley Elementary School District

August 14, 2015, Cartwright Elementary School District

August 20, 2015, SWIS-Check In Check Out (CICO), Buckeye Elementary District

August 24, 2015, Tucson Unified District

The SWIS Suite is a reliable, confidential, Web-based information system that enables schools to collect, summarize, and use student behavior data for decision making. SWIS provides school personnel with the information they need to be successful decision makers.

SWIS assists teams to improve their internal decision making and overall support plan design for individual students and their families. School teams are guided through the initial training process to utilize this data system at their school site(s).

Teachers' Institute

July 9–10, 2015

The Teachers' Institute conference, "Taking Charge of Change," focused on providing learning opportunities for teachers, instructional coaches, and interventionists. The Teachers' Institute is highly aligned to the Arizona Department of Education's Leading Change Conference to promote common vocabulary, shared understanding, and a clear focus. This conference serves special and general education teachers —preschool to grade 12, teacher leaders, instructional coaches, related service providers, teachers of ELLs, and content specialists.

A Principal's Primer for Raising Reading Achievement

July 15–16, 2015

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

LETRS: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling

Trainer of Trainings (TOT) Modules 7–9 July 20–23, 2015

Modules 1–9 Webinar Support December 9, 2015 (2 hrs.)

Module 10 Initial January 13–14, 2016

Module 10 Coaching January 15, 2016

Module 1–10 Webinar Support February 3, 2016

Module 10 TOT Feb 29–March 1, 2016

Module 10 TOT Coaching March 2, 2016

Module 10 Webinar Support March 31, 2016 (2 hrs.)

The training dates above represent the second year of LETRS Cohort 2 facilitated by the Arizona Department of Education. LETRS training is an opportunity for intensive professional development that increases teacher knowledge of literacy through the Trainer of Trainings (TOT) model. Participants were primarily instructional coaches and others responsible for providing professional development in their school, district, or charter. TOTs are provided with comprehensive and practical knowledge of how children learn to read, write, and spell, and are expected to deliver trainings at their school sites

upon successful completion of each module assessment. Teachers and administrators can use this knowledge to improve instruction and implement evidence-based literacy interventions. Training outcomes included intense professional development and knowledge of literacy in the following areas:

Module 1—The Challenge of Learning to Read

Module 2—The Speech Sounds of English: Phonetics, Phonology, and Phoneme Awareness

Module 3—Spellography for Teachers: How English Spelling Works

Module 4—The Mighty Word: Building Vocabulary and Oral Language.

Module 5—Getting Up to Speed: Developing Fluency

Module 6—Digging for Meaning: Teaching Text Comprehension

Module 7—Teaching Phonics, Word Study, and the Alphabetic Principle

Module 8—Assessment for Prevention and Early Intervention

Module 9—Teaching Beginning Spelling and Writing

Module 10—Reading Big Words: Syllabication and Advanced Decoding

STAR (in collaboration with ADE Early Childhood)

July 27–31, 2015

September 16–18, 2015

The STAR Program (Strategies for Teaching based on Autism Research), developed by Arick, Loos, Falco, Krug, 2004, is a comprehensive curriculum that includes detailed lesson plans, teaching materials, data systems and a curriculum-based assessment for teaching in the six curricular areas of receptive language, expressive language, spontaneous language, functional routines, academics, and play and social skills. The strategies used in the STAR Program have been shown to be effective with students at the preschool and elementary level.

STAR Support trains on curricula and interventions based on the principles of applied behavior analysis. They strive to provide instructors with the tools to implement effective curricula for a wide range of learners with autism spectrum disorder. The focus of the training and curricula is on the child and the functional skills he or she needs to learn to be an active, engaged member of the school, home and community.

School Resource Officer Training

September 30, 2015

February 24, 2016

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

Differentiation of Standards with Accommodations/Modifications – Amphitheater Unified school District

September 1, 2015 – Copper Creek Elementary

September 2, 2015– Mesa Verde Elementary

The district's focus was to ensure that all educators (including school leaders) were thinking similarly regarding inclusion and how to differentiate instruction to teach kids at grade level while still meeting their unique needs.

The training consisted of examination and consideration of standards with accommodations and modifications.

Multi-Tier Behavior Supports (MTBS)

Year 1 : S1: September 24–25, 2015, S2: January 7-8, 2016, S3: March 31–April 1, 2016

Year 2: S1: September 10–11, 2015, S2: November 2–3, 2015 S3: January 21–22, 2016, S4: March 1–2, 2016

Year 3: S1: September 17–18, 2015, S2: November 19–20, 2015, S3: January 28-29, 2016, S4: May 5–6, 2016

Multi-Tier Behavior Supports is a three-year training that assists school teams with the development of a school-wide approach for positive management practices. This training is based on School-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (SW-PBIS) evidence-based elements.

Year 1 focuses on designing the universal (Tier 1) plan.

Year 2 focuses on designing targeted (Tier 2) interventions for students.

Year 3 focuses on designing the intensive (Tier 3) interventions for students.

Coach for Success

Initial Training—September 24–25, 2015

Follow-Up Training—November 12–13, 2015

Webinar—December 3, 2015

In collaboration with WestEd, Arizona Department of Education's K–12 Academic Standards and Exceptional Student Services sections hosted a three-session coaching training. This coaching training prepared staff to use a process of observation and analysis in a variety of settings to support teaching and learning. Participants were guided through a differentiated coaching process and learned a system designed to provide useful feedback to teachers while at the same time guiding the improvement of effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners. When considering the language used in coaching along a continuum (direct, evaluative, consultative, collaborative, and coaching), this training provided explicit instruction on using language that is direct, evaluative, and consultative while blending in coaching language.

Professional development and coaching was provided in a four-step process. Participants learned differentiated coaching strategies, including theoretical and skill applications that served as the framework for direct, facilitative, and blended coaching models. Also, participants heard about how to determine which type of coaching message, format, and approach best supports teachers as learners. Strategies for difficult conversations and varied ways to work with adult learners, along with strategies to develop trust, improve communication, and guide adults through the change process were also addressed. The strategies learned through this professional development series provided school and district teams with practical applications that advanced their instruction toward a collective responsibility for student learning.

Directors Institute

September 29–October 1, 2015

The Directors Institute 2015: Working Together, Achieving Results covered a range of topics and current issues facing special education directors in Arizona. Participants received updates on federal and state requirements and were able to access hands-on resources that could be used immediately.

Secure Care

-

Professional development for secure care settings in Arizona focused on three main areas during the 2015-2016 school-year:

As Arizona had recently revamped the monitoring process for Secure Care facilities, training was extended to all facilities in the state through individual site trainings or trainings offered through the Arizona Correctional Educators Symposium. The type of training offered depended on whether the facility would be monitored during the fiscal year or not. As a school's monitoring year approached, specific site trainings were conducted to ensure that facility-level staff understood all of the requirements of the compliance monitoring. All secure care administrators throughout the state have been trained in this area. One hundred percent of secure care facilities in the state were trained on this process in some capacity.

Trainings on compliance and best practices in transition processes were offered in both site-based and regional trainings. Transition specialists worked directly with facilities to address needs in this area based upon IDEA compliance and monitoring results as part of Corrective Action Plan (CAP) requirements. Trainings were made available to 100% of facilities either through on-site, regional, or state-level trainings at conferences.

Arizona Career Information System (AzCIS) training was offered to facilities throughout the state. AzCIS is an online tool developed to help all students determine career preferences/aptitudes. AzCIS was converted to a paper version so facilities without Internet access could use the tools to help students participate in a meaningful way in their transition/re-entry planning. Training with this tool took place in all 15 counties in the state.

Data Management

During the 2015–2016 school year, the ESS Data Management team provided trainings on two areas of data collection:

October 1, 2015, Special Education Census and Annual Data Collection (ADC).

For the October 1, 2015, Special Education Census, a series of trainings were offered during the fall, winter, and spring to cover the entire census process to include verification (phase 1), reconciliation (phase 2), and non-reconciliation (phase 3). For the verification phase, two regional workshops and four webinars were offered. For the reconciliation phase, two regional workshops and three webinars were offered. For the non-reconciliation phase, two webinars were offered.

During the spring, the Data Management team presented on the Annual Data Collection via two regional workshops, as well as targeted webinars geared towards novice users (four), advanced users (one), preschool transition (one), secure care facilities (one) and approved private schools (one).

Additionally, at the annual Directors Institute in the fall, the ESS Data Management team presented a "Count Your Kids" session, which provided an overview of the annual child count data collection.

Secondary Transition: Regional Training

During the 2015–2016 school year, Secondary Transition specialists provided a 1-½-day training series on three topics and reached stakeholders in all Arizona counties. Topics for the training consisted of an introduction to the requirements of a compliant IEP secondary transition plan, implementation of evidence-based predictors of postsecondary success, and a workshop to assist participants in applying evidence-based best practices in developing meaningful secondary transition plans for students with disabilities. Stakeholders included public school special and general education teachers, administrators, and local agency representatives that provide transition services such as vocational rehabilitation, mental health services, and the Division of Developmental Disabilities.

Secondary Transition: Technical Assistance for Individual PEAs and Private Day Schools

During the 2015–2016 school year, technical assistance was provided to individual public, charter, and approved private day schools on various topics related to the secondary transition planning process. Assistance was provided via campus and district visits, phone calls, review of plans, and in-person support on compliance and best practice for meeting Indicator 13 transition requirements.

Secondary Transition: Arizona Community of Practice on Transition:

During the 2015–2016 school year, the Arizona Community of Practice on Transition (AZCoPT) met monthly to identify and tackle common initiatives among all partners. A strategic plan was developed during the Capacity Building Institute, hosted by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition, where multiple partners participated with the development and/or approval of the goals.

One initiative within the strategic plan included the Data Sharing Agreement, which has resulted in a fully executed contract this year. The Data Sharing Agreement is between the AZ Rehabilitation Services Administration and the ADE and allows both parties to exchange personal identifiable information for the purpose of program evaluation. Through its proposed audit and evaluation, ADE seeks to use this data for purposes of: (a) identifying the connection between successful PSO data and transition services offered during high school; (b) researching whether and to what degree participation in transition services beyond high school graduation positively affects students' PSO engagement data; (c) ensuring that ADE employs and distributes staff and other resources to appropriately meet demographic needs of both students and educators.

Another one of AZCoPT's main efforts focused on providing a professional development opportunity in which representatives from a number of state agencies provided information to participants on how to partner in transition planning. Panel members discussed their agencies' unique roles in supporting students and families during their school and adult lives. Participants learned about eligibility requirements for each program, the type of services available, the agency's role in transition planning, and how the agencies work together to support the needs of young adults with disabilities as they progress from high school to adult living. This presentation provided information from agency experts representing the Division of Developmental Disabilities, the Office for Children with Special Health Care Needs (OCSHCN), the Arizona Rehabilitation Services Administration, the Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, the Statewide Independent Living Council, Arizona's Health Care Cost Containment System/ Division of Health Care Management, and Raising Special Kids.

Through the financial support from the OCSHCN and the training from Raising Special Kids, the AZCoPT filled the young adult membership role this year. All future initiatives with these partnering agencies will include the young adult's participation, feedback, and perspective.

Secondary Transition: Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA)

During the 2015–2016 school year, constituents and stakeholders were informed of the newly reauthorized Rehabilitation Act and the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), which are now combined into one called the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Attendees were made aware of the new youth and young adult requirements for youth and young adults with and without disabilities. The ADE/ESS Secondary Transition Regional Training incorporated a brief introduction to WIOA in which the content presented to participants had a focus on how WIOA impacts the secondary transition planning process. As information was made available from various sources, including national technical assistance centers, the links to those resources were posted on the ADE/ESS Secondary Transition Website for all ADE constituents to view and access.

Two subcommittees have been developed in order to launch collaborative efforts as required through WIOA. One subcommittee is comprised of multiple stakeholders and is focused on developing a guidance document to support the public in understanding Section 511 of the law. As part of the second subcommittee, the AZ Rehabilitation Services Administration, the Division of Developmental Disabilities, and the ADE/ESS are all meeting regularly to make updates to their Intergovernmental Service Agreement. The amendments to the agreement will include WIOA requirements that affect the collaboration of the three parties, as well as the provision of their transition

services.

Secondary Transition: Employment First Initiative

During the 2015–2016 school year and as part of the Employment First (EF) Committee, the ADE/ESS Secondary Transition team continued to inform constituents of the message and strategic plan that guides education and agency staff to look at employment first for ALL students before considering other, more restrictive environments. The Employment First initiative continues to be included in all secondary transition trainings to provide guidance to staff working with students with significant disabilities. A major initiative of the EF Committee includes offering professional development to individuals seeking guidance and clarification on EF. Appropriate events and venues were identified in which the EF Committee presented to 828 participants via various conferences on the topic of EF. Information was also

disseminated in various other settings with further outreach to several other audiences of approximately 100 individuals.

Over the last year, the group of stakeholders involved in the AZ Employment First Initiative have continued to meet to expand and begin implementing the Employment First Strategic Plan. Accomplishments and successes celebrated include the Sonoran UCEDD's and the Rehabilitation Services Administration/Vocational Rehabilitation's partnering to collaboratively create, fund, and secure a position for leading the efforts in moving this initiative forward. Also, celebrated was having the Division of Developmental Disabilities secure an Employment Services Manager, who is co-leading the efforts around the initiative. These are new positions for the state of Arizona, and their creation shows the commitment to this initiative from partnering agencies.

In addition, four Employment First subcommittees were, or are in the process of being, established. The subcommittees are working with stakeholders to address: Communicating the Employment First message, Employer Engagement, Systems Transformation, and Youth and Young Adults in Transition. In addition, an Employment First website is under development, plain language materials are being created, and the Employment First message is being spread throughout the state of Arizona through local and state presentations/conferences addressing all audiences.

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

During the 2015–2016 school year, training was provided for those who oversee or administer the Post School Outcomes (PSO) Survey. The PSO Survey, conducted one year after students exit high school, is required to be completed by districts and charter schools who serve students with disabilities ages 16 and over each year between June 1st and September 30th. Training included the requirements for the PSO Survey and how to incorporate suggested tips and techniques to ensure the data collection was valid and accurate, and results obtained were useful. Training was conducted via webinar, individual phone conference, and in person.

Secondary Transition: 2016 Transition Conference

Arizona's Sixteenth Annual Transition Conference, *Trending in Transition: Education, Engagement, Employment,* was held August 29–31, 2016, at the Talking Stick Resort in Scottsdale, Arizona. This unique conference brought together over 900 participants comprised of students with disabilities, their families, school-level providers, and outside agencies who provide support to families and schools. The 2016 conference was especially exciting as the Arizona Department of Education offered more than 125 scholarships to students and family members through a partnership with the Office of Children with Special Health Care Needs (OCSHCN).

The event provided professional development aimed at increasing post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. Session strands were focused on students with disabilities, their families and caregivers, and professionals working in schools or agencies. National and local presenters brought their expertise to the 98 sessions offered over three days, and keynote addresses focused on self-advocacy and building support systems for students with disabilities.

This conference utilizes the efforts of the Transition Planning Committee, which

includes ADE, RSA/Vocational Rehabilitation, the Division of Developmental Disabilities, the OCSHCN, Raising Special Kids, and PEA stakeholders .

The annual Transition Conference is traditionally the largest conference that the Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student Services hosts, and it reaches capacity within two weeks of registration opening.

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

During the 2015–2016 school year, ASPIRE staff provided ½-day trainings in rural counties. Topics for the trainings consisted of an introduction to ASPIRE-related services, parent resources, benefits planning, and self-determination for youth and youth employment. Stakeholders included ASPIRE youth, parents, family members, and representatives from local community agencies.

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

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

Assistive Technology

During the 2015-2016 school year, a capacity building grant series known as Az-Tech provided the foundation for capacity building and systemic change in schools related to assistive technology (AT). Teams of educators known as Az-Tech grant teams participated in grant-funded training workshops in the fundamentals of AT and universal design for learning (UDL). At the end of the year, teams were better equipped to consider and implement AT tools and strategies to support students with disabilities and contribute to the training of other education professionals in their local education agencies (LEAs).

One-day public and regional trainings: AT is in the mATh, iPads in the Classroom, Executive Functioning, AT Overview, Chrome Extensions to Support Struggling Students.

Individualized in-person and telephone assistance to support teachers and other school district staff in the selection and implementation of various assistive technology devices, tools, and software to support students in accessing the curriculum was provided. These technical support services included text-to-speech software, speech-to-text software, SmartPens, mathematics supports, math manipulatives, equation editors, physical access to the environment and academic materials, Google Chrome Extensions, iPad applications, and Android applications. Technical support also included specific research to overcome a specific barrier for individual students and included information in the following areas:

Chrome extensions

AT overviews

Training on items that schools borrow from the Lending Library

AAC support

Eye gaze

AAC apps

Switch access for iPads

AAC implementation

AT consideration

AT evaluation

AT for writing

AT for reading

AT for mobility

AT for executive function

AT for math

Mobile technology (iPads, Android tablets)

Institute of Higher Education (IHE) Pre-Service Training: Assistive Technology in the Classroom: What Arizona Teachers Need to Know, AAC in the Classroom

Pima Community College Transition Fair: Tech Hacks were presented for high school transition specialists, special educators, and vocational rehabilitation specialists. Training demonstrated free and low cost assistive technology high school students can learn that will carry over to higher education.

Northern Arizona University STEM Expo: Assistive Technology to Support Struggling Students in STEM (display)

AzTAP Annual Conference: AT is in the mATh and AAC for Life.

AZ-TASH Annual Conference: Mobile Technology to Support Struggling Students

Arizona Transition Conference: Assistive Technology beyond High School

Arizona Director's Institute: ADE-ESS-AT Lending Library

Arizona Teacher's Institute: Poster Session – Assistive Technology Lending Library

ECAP/School Counseling

During the 2015-2016 school year, the Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP)/School Counseling staff offered these opportunities to educators:

1. In cooperation with the Career and Technology Education (CTE) section, staff created a new Workplace Employability Skills (WES) online assessment tool housed in the AzCIS (Arizona Career Information System). It was developed using the skills standards and metrics developed by the Arizona Skills Commission. Resources were defined, and WES trainings were offered. Conference sessions were also offered at a number of Arizona conferences. The goal was to have the Arizona Workspace Employability Skills in all high school classrooms.
2. Staff conducted site visits to provide technical assistance and discuss the school's Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP) process and documents.
3. Regional ECAPs: Moving From Compliance to Culture workshop-trainings were offered throughout the year. Hundreds of Arizona Educators attended these half-day sessions.
4. AzCIS was provided free to all K–12 public education and charter schools that care to use it for their students' career and educational planning needs. A variety of venues were available for training needs: face-to-face workshops, regional trainings, school site trainings, and conferences. Monthly webinars hosted in Blackboard were also offered to educators.
5. Regional College and Career Ready trainings were provided for school counselors and school educators. The topics covered were: Civic Engagement; Workplace Employability Skills; Career and Technology Education (CTE)—Programs of Study; What Is College and Career Readiness for ALL Students?; Using the ECAP Planning Process and Resources for CCR; Community College Updates; The Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA); Using Your School College and Career Ready data to Make Change; and Using AzCIS for ECAPs.
6. With CTE Innovation Grant money, a new professional development program has been developed for Arizona Educators. The new Arizona Career Ready program has four modules, and can be accessed online in ADE Blackboard, face-to-face, or in a blended format. There are five trained facilitators who have now offered

<div style="border:1px solid">

modules four times. The professional development opportunity is available for teachers, school counselors, CTE personnel, and administrators.

7. ADE staff, with external stakeholders , offered trainings and conference sessions asking the question: "Do Students in Arizona Need 2–3 ILPs (Individual Learning Plans)?"

</div>

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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

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

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
			R e m o v e
ta ffy 2015 memo.pdf	Cathy Sproul		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 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 2014 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 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

The annual performance report (APR) on the State's progress and/or slippage for FFY 2014 is available on the ADE/ESS Web site at http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/ under the list titled Annual Performance Report. The title of the APR is *Arizona FFY 2014 Annual Performance Report.*

The annual public reports were available on the ADE/ESS Web site at http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/ under the list titled Public Reports School Year 2014–2015, within 120 days of the February 2, 2016, submission of the APR. These reports list the performance of each school district and charter school in Arizona on the SPP targets.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State's 2016 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and required the State to work with appropriate entities.

The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2015 and 2016 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2016 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2016, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2016 and 2017 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2017 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2018, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicators

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, and representatives from charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,080	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,886	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	64.42%	Calculate ☐

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
5,080	7,886	63.34%	80.00%	64.42%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's

academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

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

Conditions to Graduate with a Regular Diploma

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

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	27.90%	27.80%	27.70%	26.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,896	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	null	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	22	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,661	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	20	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,661	6,599	24.09%	27.90%	25.17%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

   A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
   B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
   C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			23.50%	24.00%	24.50%	25.00%	25.50%	26.00%	26.50%	0%	0%
Data		12.16%	18.25%	5.40%	5.33%	2.70%	1.39%	2.90%	0%	0%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0%	2.90%	3.00%	4.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?
◉ Yes ○ No
Are you reporting AYP or AMO?
○ AYP ○ AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
635	null	null		0%	

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

  A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
  B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
  C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	70,956	66,415	97.44%	95.00%	93.60%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In FFY2014, Arizona's participation rates included both the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), a well-established, single statewide assessment administered on specific dates in grade 10, and the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), a series of end-of-course (EOC) exams given in 9th, 10th, and 11th grades and which had multi-week windows for completion. In FFY 2015, Arizona's participation rates included AzMERIT only. Hence, the exclusion of data from a familiar system with rigid administration guidelines, and the subsequent exclusive reliance on an unfamiliar system with significantly more flexible guidelines, may have contributed to the slippage in participation rate.

Additionally, during FFY 2015, the information technology infrastructure that hosts and supports statewide student data changed, as ADE moved from using the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) to the Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System (AELAS). This large data system transformation included changes to data submission procedures and integrity processing. These structural and procedural changes may explain the slippage reflected in the participation rate data.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	70,956	65,485	98.19%	95.00%	92.29%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In FFY2014, Arizona's participation rates included both the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), a well-established, single statewide assessment administered on specific dates in grade 10, and the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), a series of end-of-course (EOC) exams given in 9th, 10th, and 11th grades and which had multi-week windows for completion. In FFY 2015, Arizona's participation

rates included AzMERIT only. Hence, the exclusion of data from a familiar system with rigid administration guidelines, and the subsequent exclusive reliance on an unfamiliar system with significantly more flexible guidelines, may have contributed to the slippage in the participation rate.

Additionally, during FFY 2015, the information technology infrastructure that hosts and supports statewide student data changed, as ADE moved from using the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) to the Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System (AELAS). This large data system transformation included changes to data submission procedures and integrity processing. These structural and procedural changes may explain the slippage reflected in participation rate data.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

The FFY 2015 Annual Performance Report (APR) gives information about the participation of students
with IEPs. The APR is located on the ADE/ESS Web site at http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/ under the list titled Annual Performance Report.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

   A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
   B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
   C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	90.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	89.00%	92.00%	95.00%	97.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	91.00%	93.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	88.00%	91.00%	94.00%	97.00%

Key:

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
	G ≥ HS	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%	98.00%
Math	**A ≥** Grade 3	86.00%	90.00%	93.00%	97.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	85.00%	89.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	83.00%	87.00%	91.00%	96.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	84.00%	88.00%	92.00%	96.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	9,314	1,768	16.80%	90.00%	18.98%
B Grade 4	9,822	1,816	15.40%	89.00%	18.49%
C Grade 5	9,740	1,503	10.82%	91.00%	15.43%
D Grade 6	8,984	1,026	9.60%	92.00%	11.42%
E Grade 7	8,344	1,074	9.13%	92.00%	12.87%
F Grade 8	8,058	731	8.84%	88.00%	9.07%
G HS	5,476	233	16.08%	91.00%	4.25%

Explanation of Group G Slippage

In FFY 2014, Arizona's high school State assessment transitioned from the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), a single test administered in 10th grade, to the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), a series of end-of-course (EOC) exams given in 9th, 10th, and 11th grades for both English and mathematics. The standards and cut scores for proficiency on the AzMERIT were significantly more rigorous than those on the AIMS.

Because the expectation was that students complete all required assessments from any previous years, in FFY 2014, ADE used a "banking" method to capture assessment data. As a result, the data included both AzMERIT end-of-course scores and AIMS scores from the prior two years. Additionally, to meet EdFacts reporting requirements, ADE adjusted the data to include 11th graders only.

In FFY 2015, ADE continued to use a banking method for 11th grade only. However, because the AIMS, a less rigorous test, had been phased out, only AzMERIT scores were being reflected in the data. Therefore, as a result of the change in assessment data—which, again, for FFY 2015 reflected scores exclusively from the more rigorous AzMERIT—a decrease in proficiency rate was reported.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Grade 3	9,415	2,264	19.51%	86.00%	24.05%
B Grade 4	9,876	1,911	16.70%	85.00%	19.35%
C Grade 5	9,804	1,737	14.60%	84.00%	17.72%

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
D Grade 6	9,044	1,184	10.03%	83.00%	13.09%
E Grade 7	8,445	940	9.56%	84.00%	11.13%
F Grade 8	8,116	921	9.44%	80.00%	11.35%
G HS	4,115	148	9.29%	84.00%	3.60%

Explanation of Group G Slippage

In FFY 2014, Arizona's high school state assessment transitioned from the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), a single test administered in 10th grade, to the Arizona Measurement of Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT), a series of end-of-course (EOC) exams given in 9th, 10th, and 11th grades for both English and mathematics. The standards and cut scores for proficiency on the AzMERIT were significantly more rigorous than those on the AIMS.

Because the expectation was that students complete all required assessments from any previous years, in FFY 2014, ADE used a "banking" method to capture assessment data. As a result, the data included both AzMERIT end-of-course scores and AIMS scores from the prior two years. Additionally, to meet EdFacts reporting requirements, ADE adjusted the data to include 11th graders only.

In FFY 2015, ADE continued to use a banking method for 11th grade only. However, because the AIMS, a less rigorous test, had been phased out, only AzMERIT scores were being reflected in the data. Therefore, as a result of the change in assessment data—which, again, for FFY 2015 reflected scores exclusively from the more rigorous AzMERIT—a decrease in proficiency rate was reported.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

The FFY 2015 Annual Performance Report (APR) gives information about the participation of students
with IEPs. The APR is located on the ADE/ESS Web site at http://www.azed.gov/special-education/resources/spp-apr/
under the list titled Annual Performance Report.

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

Note: there is a discrepancy between reading/mathematics assessment proficiency rates at the high school level as reported in the FFY 2014 SPP/APR and the historical FFY2014 data as reflected above. The data represented in the FFY 2014 SPP/APR includes all high school end-of-course exams for grades 9–12. This proficiency data was resubmitted in February 2016, adjusted to include assessment scores for 11th grade only. As a result of this more accurate resubmission, high school proficiency scores increased significantly.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

    A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

○ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	627	0%	0%	0%

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

◉ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona uses Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to calculate rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs. Arizona uses the State Bar method to determine significant discrepancy. The State rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with IEPs is 0.56%. The State Bar, 5.56%, is five percentage points greater than the State rate.

A district or charter school has significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with IEPs is 5.56% or greater. There must be at least 50 students in the denominator of a suspension/expulsion rate for a district or charter school to

be flagged as having significant discrepancy. The denominator represents the overall special education enrollment at the district or charter school.

Using the minimum "n" size of 50 students for overall special education enrollment, Arizona excluded 5 PEAs from the calculation (excluded 5 from 627) and used the total number of PEAs (627) in the State in the denominator.

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

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

The 2014–2015 data were reported by the PEAs through the Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as the data reported under section 618, Table 5 (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for school year 2014-2015, which was submitted on November 2, 2015. The October 1, 2014, child count data are the same as the State's data reported under section 618, Table 1, Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Note that the source of this data is from FFY 2014. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year because the number of charter schools that may open and close from year to year varies.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)
Description of review

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

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

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

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

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

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

  ○ The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

    Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

  ◉ The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

    A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

○ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1	0	627	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona uses Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to calculate rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs. Arizona uses the State Bar method to determine significant discrepancy. The State rate of suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days for all students with IEPs is 0.56%. The State Bar, 5.56%, is five percentage points greater than the State rate.

A district or charter school has significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate greater than 10 days for students with IEPs is 5.56% or greater. There must be at least 50 students in the denominator of a suspension/expulsion rate for a district or charter school to be flagged as having significant discrepancy. The denominator represents the overall special education enrollment at the district or charter school.

Using the minimum "n" size of 50 students for overall special education enrollment, Arizona excluded 5 PEAs from the calculation (excluded 5 from 627) and used the total number of PEAs (627) in the State in the denominator.

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

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

The 2014–2015 data were reported by the PEAs through the Arizona Safety Accountability for Education (Az SAFE) application. The data are the same as the data reported under section 618, Table 5 (Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal) for the school year 2014–2015, which was submitted on November 2, 2015. The October 1, 2014, child count data are the same as the State's data reported under section 618, Table 1, Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Note that the source of this data is from FFY 2014. The total number of PEAs in Arizona varies from year to year because the number of charter schools that may open and close from year to year varies.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)
Description of review

The State reviewed the PEAs' suspension/expulsion data by race or ethnicity and identified one PEA with a significant discrepancy. This PEA reviewed 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 determine if these contributed to the significant discrepancy.

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

The practices of this PEA were reviewed by means of a self-assessment. The PEA conducted an assessment of their 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 file reviews.

Upon completion of this review, Arizona determined that the PEA was in compliance with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

◯ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%
Target B ≤	15.00%	14.90%	14.70%	14.50%
Target C ≤	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	1.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	117,264	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	76,153	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,304	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	2,085	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	108	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	286	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	76,153	117,264	63.65%	64.00%	64.94%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	17,304	117,264	14.75%	15.00%	14.76%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,479	117,264	2.06%	2.00%	2.11%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%
Target B ≤	44.60%	44.40%	44.20%	44.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	15,328	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	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	7,872	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	6,439	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	54	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and	7,872	15,328	51.82%	50.50%	51.36%

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,493	15,328	41.95%	44.60%	42.36%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%
Target A2 ≥	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
Target B1 ≥	79.50%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%
Target B2 ≥	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%
Target C1 ≥	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%
Target C2 ≥	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	69.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice when determining targets for the future.

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3318.00

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	173.00	5.21%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	402.00	12.12%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	799.00	24.08%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1321.00	39.81%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	623.00	18.78%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2120.00	2695.00	78.74%	80.50%	78.66%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1944.00	3318.00	60.07%	63.50%	58.59%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

In FFY 2015, the percentage of 3–4 year-old students included in the population increased again. This continued trend of an increase in the number of younger children included in the calculation could have contributed to the slight slippage in "positive social and emotional skills" area. Another potential reason for the slippage was the lack of understanding at the PEA level of the need to align special education counts with outcomes data reporting. For instance, the number of speech-language impaired students who were inadvertently omitted from the data reporting could have contributed to the slippage, as this population tends to show significant progress, given specialized instruction. Additionally, the number of students with more significant challenges entering into programs increased, which may have contributed to the slippage as well.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	194.00	5.85%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	383.00	11.54%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	781.00	23.54%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1418.00	42.74%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	542.00	16.34%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2199.00	2776.00	77.68%	79.50%	79.21%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1960.00	3318.00	59.32%	62.50%	59.07%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	347.00	10.46%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	398.00	12.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	580.00	17.48%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1216.00	36.65%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	777.00	23.42%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1796.00	2541.00	74.35%	76.50%	70.68%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	1993.00	3318.00	63.33%	67.50%	60.07%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Since there was significant slippage in the area of the number of children who substantially increased their rate of growth in appropriate behaviors, time was spent analyzing the data more closely. A potential reason for the slippage was the lack of understanding at the PEA level of the need to align special education counts with outcomes data reporting. For instance, the number of speech-language impaired students who were inadvertently omitted from the data reporting could have contributed to the slippage, as this population tends to show significant progress regarding appropriate behaviors. Additionally, the number of students with more significant challenges entering into programs increased, which may have contributed to the slippage in this area.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Since there was significant slippage in the area of the number of children who were functioning within age expectations, time was spent analyzing the data more closely. A potential reason for the slippage was the lack of understanding at the PEA level of the need to align special education counts with outcomes data reporting. For instance, the number of speech-language impaired students who were inadvertently omitted from the data reporting could have contributed to the slippage, as this population tends to show significant progress. Additionally, the number of students with more significant challenges entering into programs increased, which may have contributed to the slippage as well.

Was sampling used?   No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)?   No
Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Arizona uses the "Widely Held Expectations" report contained in Teaching Strategies GOLD. This instrument uses a uniform scale that presents scores for each area of development and learning. Using these scaled scores enables teachers to compare groups of children's scores across areas to determine which areas need additional attention and allows them to better understand each child as a whole. Specifically, the Widely Held Expectations tool assesses children in the areas of social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and mathematics as they relate to the requisite OSEP indicators. Expectations are defined as age ranges for children's development and learning. While typical progressions are presented for most objectives, they are not rigid requirements, and a range of scores exists for each area and age group.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	59.00%	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on parent involvement to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's policy advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, and charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. During the SEAP meetings, the ADE/ESS personnel respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members and consider the panel's advice in determining targets for the SPP.

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

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
9300.00	10103.00	85.51%	59.00%	92.05%

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

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

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Valid and Reliable Data

Arizona ensures that the data are valid and reliable by offering extensive ongoing technical assistance to PEAs. Initial survey instructions detail the steps that

PEAs must follow to distribute survey instructions and confidential user codes/passwords to all parents who have a child with a disability. PEAs are given surplus user codes/passwords to have ready for the parents of transfer students. PEAs also receive guidance on how to maximize their parental response and involvement rates.

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

Race/Ethnicity of Child of Parent Respondent	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Special Education Population (Child Count)	Percentage of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Hispanic/Latino of Any Race	3039	**30.08%**	58,879	**44.41%**
American Indian or Alaska Native	593	**5.87%**	8,055	**6.29%**
Asian	184	**1.82%**	1,807	**1.36%**
Black or African-American	445	**4.40%**	8,384	**6.32%**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	40	**.40%**	339	**0.26%**
White	5,066	**50.14%**	51,660	**39.96%**
Two or More Races	736	**7.28%**	3,468	**2.62%**
Total	10,103		132,592	

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

The response rates for American Indian or Alaska Native (5.87%)**,** Black/African-American (4.40%) and Hispanic parents (30.08%) are lower than the State special education population data of 6.08%, 6.32%, % and 44.41 %, respectively. It is possible that the responses in the multi-racial category (race/ethnicity was self-reported) and the responses that did not report ethnicity (which combined would account for 7.64% of the responses) may have been reported differently when other data-collection methods were used. Some of these variances in race/ethnicity responses may be affecting the percentage of American Indian or Alaska Native, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino participation. It should be noted that the percentage of respondents who selected the two or more races is significantly higher than the State race/ethnicity statistics for that group.

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

Child Age Group	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Number of Special Education Population (Child Count)	Percentage of Special Education Population (Child Count)
Ages 3–5	1,385	**13.71 %**	15,328	**11.56%**
Ages 6–13	6,105	**60.43 %**	77,073	**58.13%**
Ages 14–22	2,613	**25.86 %**	40,191	**30.31%**
Total	10,103		132,592	

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

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

Was sampling used?   No

Was a collection tool used?   Yes
Is it a new or revised collection tool?   Yes
◉ **Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State**

○ **No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State**
Submitted collection tool: FFY 2015 Parent Involvement Survey Information

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: ▨ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ▢ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

○ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	635	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

<u>**Definition of Disproportionate Representation**</u>

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

<u>**Methodology**</u>

The data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to produce a weighted risk ratio (WRR) that identified all racial/ethnic groups for all PEAs in the State. Data for over representation were examined. PEAs with a cell size of 30 or more students in the target racial/ethnic group and in the other racial/ethnic groups and that met the weighted risk ratio criteria for over representation were flagged for a review of policies, procedures, and practices by the State. PEAs with a lower cell size in the target groups were not flagged because false positives were identified as a function of the small number rather than as a result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. Arizona included the total number of PEAs in the State (635) in the denominator. Of the 635 PEAs, 15 were eliminated from the analyses because a weighted risk ratio could not be calculated for any racial/ethnic group.

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

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

Arizona ensures that PEAs' policies, procedures and practices are reviewed as required by 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.600(d)(3). and 300.602(a). The data are

analyzed annually and PEAs may be flagged each year for over representation, according to the State's definition. When a PEA is flagged, then the policies, procedures, and practices of the PEA are reviewed annually to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures

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

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

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

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices

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

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

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

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

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of n the first year, then ESS program specialist:

  - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable, and
  - Validates the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.

- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the PEA is required to:

  - Review current monitoring data, if applicable;
  - Review the prior year's self-assessment and describe the issues identified;
  - Describe the steps taken to resolve those issues;
  - Describe any current concerns regarding possible inappropriate identification;
  - Describe the resources and technical assistance used to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and
  - Review individual student files using the State's monitoring forms:

    - The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the file reviews to validate the decisions made by the PEAs.
    - The ESS specialists verify correction of instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific, through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
    - The ESS specialists ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

	Corrected Within One Year	Corrected	
0	null	null	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: ▨ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ▢ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

◉ Number of districts in the State

○ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3	0	635	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

<u>Definition of Disproportionate Representation</u>

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

<u>Methodology</u>

The data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) to produce a weighted risk ratio (WRR) that identified all racial/ethnic groups and six disability categories for all PEAs in the State. Data for over representation were examined. PEAs with a cell size of 30 or more students in the target racial/ethnic group and also in the other racial/ethnic groups and meeting the weighted risk ratio criteria for over representation were flagged for a review of policies, procedures, and practices by the State. PEAs with a lower cell size in the target groups were not flagged because false positives were identified as a function of the small number rather than as a result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. Arizona included the total number of PEAs in the State (635) in the denominator. Of the 635 PEAs, 15 were eliminated from the analyses because a weighted risk ratio could not be calculated for any racial/ethnic group.

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

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

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

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Policies and Procedures

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

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

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

Arizona's Review of PEAs' Practices

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

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

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

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

- If the PEA did not have disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the ESS program specialist:

  - Reviews current monitoring data, if applicable, and
  - Validates the prior year's self-assessment by reviewing a sample of student files.

- If the PEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification the first year, then the PEA is required to:

  - Review current monitoring data, if applicable;
  - Review the prior year's self-assessment and describe the issues identified;
  - Describe the steps taken to resolve those issues;
  - Describe any current concerns regarding possible inappropriate identification;
  - Describe the resources and technical assistance used to help address the issues related to disproportionate representation within the agency; and
  - Review individual student files using the State's monitoring forms:

    - The ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits during the file reviews to validate the decisions made by the PEAs.
    - The ESS specialists verify correction of instances of noncompliance, including child-specific instances, through on-site visits and/or desk audits.
    - The ESS specialists ensure that regulatory requirements are being implemented based on subsequent file reviews of updated data.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: ▢ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ▢ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,193	2,189	99.60%	100%	99.82%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	4

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 2015 Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidents of noncomplicance

Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/15/17

4

4

Range of Days beyond the Timeline

Range of Days   3–25

Mean   12.25

Median   10.5

Mode   N/A

Reasons for Delay

Interruption in school calendar, such as spring or summer break   2

Lack of understanding of the evaluation process   2

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

◉ **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

○ **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

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

○ **State monitoring**

○ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 11 are from the Arizona monitoring system. During FFY 2014, public education agencies (PEAs) were selected for monitoring each fiscal year based on the results of a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. However, beginning in FFY 2015, the monitoring system changed to include all PEAs that conducted an initial evaluation. Hence, both the reported (a) number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received and (b) number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days sharply increased for FFY 2015.

Data Collection

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

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

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

Valid and Reliable Data

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

Evaluation Timeline

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

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2015

During FFY 2015, a finding for Indicator 11 was issued when the line item for the evaluation timeline was found to be noncompliant. The finding was a written notification to the PEA by the State that the line item was noncompliant, and the finding included a description of a Federal or State statute or regulation. The source of information on which to base a finding of noncompliance was an individual student file.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

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

- ADE/ESS specialists conducted follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify correction of all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child-specific. The specialists reviewed the child specific files to determine that the evaluation was completed within 60 calendar days from the date of written notification of noncompliance.

- ADE/ESS specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files and/or conducted interviews with the special education administrators during follow-up visits and/or desk audits to determine if all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child specific, were corrected, and to ensure ongoing sustainability of the implementation of the regulatory requirements regarding initial evaluations.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	2,743
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	491
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,156
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.	65
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	11

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	2,156	2,176	99.57%	100%	99.08%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	20

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

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

Child did not pass vision or hearing test	4
Interruption of school schedule; summer birthday	2
Late Referral from Part C	14
Total	20

In FFY 2015, 20 children were not transitioned on time due to late referrals from from the Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP) as compared with 9 in 2014, 11 in FFY 2013, 9 in FFY 2012, 21 in FFY 2011, and 39 in FFY 2010. School districts are asked to submit an alert to the ADE Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) any time they receive a late referral from AzEIP that was not in category d (parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services) or category e (children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays). Each late referral from AzEIP to a district is reported to the State AzEIP office. The State AzEIP office provides technical assistance and follow-up to the local service-providing agency.

Similarly, if a local service-providing agency is reporting difficulty with a school district, the local agency issues an alert to the State AzEIP office. The ADE/ECSE provides technical assistance and follow-up to the school district. The ADE/ESCE and AzEIP maintain a shared database to track resolution of the difficulties indicated on the alerts.

Challenges with the completion of hearing and vision screenings and the resulting time required for follow-ups are an inherent part of evaluating young children; these challenges at times cause delays in transition. Arizona has worked diligently to provide resources and facilitate collaborative efforts between Head Start organizations, school districts, and Part C agencies. This has helped Part C service coordinators encourage families to have regular hearing

screenings.

Range of Days Beyond Third Birthday

Range of Days	2–199*

*The 199 days beyond the child's third birthday was due to a late referral from Part C.

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

○ **State monitoring**

● **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 12 are reported annually by all public education agencies (PEAs) in Arizona that have children who transition from Part C to Part B. Data are included for the entire reporting year, from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

Data Collection

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

Valid and Reliable Data

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

Definition of Finding

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

FFY 2015 Noncompliance

# findings of noncompliance	# of findings corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/15/17
9	9

Arizona made 9 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, all 9 findings have been corrected as of January 15, 2017.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	null	0

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

As specified in OSEP's June 2015 FFY 2013 SPP/APR Response, Arizona verified that each PEA with noncompliance reflected in the data:

- is correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring; and

- has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local education agency (LEA), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

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

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

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

Key: ☐ Gray – Data Prior to Baseline   ☐ Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
1,605	1,648	89.38%	100%	97.39%

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

◉ **State monitoring**

○ **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance

Number of findings by incidence of noncompliance	Number of findings by incidence corrected prior to one-year timeline as of 1/29/17
43	40

Arizona made 43 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015. Although the PEAs have one year to correct the noncompliance, 40 findings have been corrected as of January 29, 2017.

Data Source

The data for Indicator 13 are from the Arizona monitoring system. In FFY 2014, public education agencies (PEAs) were selected for monitoring each fiscal year based on the results of a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. In FFY 2015, the monitoring system changed to include all PEAs with youth with IEPs aged 16 and above. Hence, both the reported Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above and the number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition saw a sharp increase for FFY 2015.

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

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

Data Collection

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

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

- Direct — PEAs and the ADE/ESS review student files and collect data for Indicator 13. The ADE/ESS staff inputs data.

Valid and Reliable Data

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

Definition of Finding for Monitoring for FFY 2015

During FFY 2015, 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.

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

Compliance for this indicator exhibited a marked increase for FFY 2015. This increase is most likely due to the change in data collection from select PEAs to all PEAs whose enrollment included youth with an IEP aged 16 or above.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
29	29	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

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

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

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	29.60%	31.10%	32.60%	34.10%
Target B ≥	64.20%	66.20%	68.20%	70.20%
Target C ≥	76.70%	78.00%	79.30%	80.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2014–2015 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported on student progress to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies.

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

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

FFY 2015 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	6332.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1416.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2468.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	508.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	356.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1416.00	6332.00	23.09%	29.60%	22.36%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3884.00	6332.00	58.74%	64.20%	61.34%
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)	4748.00	6332.00	73.51%	76.70%	74.98%

Was sampling used?   No

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

Data Source and Collection Methods

Beginning in FFY14, ADE/ESS changed from using a sampling method to a census method to collect post school outcome (PSO) data. This represented a significant change to the sampling method used by ADE/ESS since the inception of OSEP-mandated PSO reporting. ADE/ESS branded the census methodology, "Everyone Counts, Everyone In," to inform PEAs of the change and to facilitate the switch from a sampling to a census data collection methodology. PEAs were provided information on the state's rationale for the change, as well as training and marketing materials designed to assist PEAs that serve transition-aged youth in the collection of post school outcome data annually; this change allowed for better results-driven analysis and improvements to secondary transition programs at the state and local levels. OSEP was informed of this change.

During FFY15, 278 PEAs had leavers who met the criteria (youth with a current IEP who aged out, graduated, or dropped out) for participation in the PSO Survey. Of this number, 158 or 57% of PEAs that were required to participate in the PSO data collection had ten or fewer leavers while 20 or 7% of PEAs had 100 or more leavers. A total of 8,409 youth statewide were eligible to take the PSO Survey during the FFY15 data collection period. Of the 278 PEAs required to participate in the PSO Survey, 268 (96%) met the requirement.

In order for PEAs to communicate with students for the PSO Survey, PEAs gather contact information on student leavers so they can reach these leavers the next year. Schools either input the data into the online PSO data collection system or maintain student contact information locally for use the next year. The PSO data collection system uses a secure application as part of ADEConnect, a secure single sign-on identity management system. The application includes an auto-population of student demographic information and exit reason imported directly from the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), a Web-based system for reporting all student-level details to the ADE. PEAs designate district or charter school personnel to contact student leavers or designated family members (i.e., parents, grandparents, or guardians), conduct phone interviews, and input survey data into the online PSO data collection system. Youth or family members were contacted between June 1 and September 30, 2016, after they were out of school for at least one year.

Missing Data

Arizona's PSO response rate for FFY15 was 75% (8,409 youth eligible for contact and 6,332 respondents). The FFY15 PSO Survey is missing data on 2,077 former students or 25% of the leavers. An analysis of missing data indicated that the largest segments of missing data were the result of four factors:

1. schools were not able to contact leavers after three attempts (939 former students or 45% of the missing data)
2. schools did not have correct contact information for leavers (730 former students or 35% of the missing data)
3. schools did not collect contact information for leavers (102 former students or 5% of the missing data)
4. the respondents refused to participate (187 former students or 10% of the missing data)

Selection Bias

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

Response Rate

The FFY15 survey response rate was 75.3%. Arizona's FFY15 census included 8,409 youth who were eligible to take the survey. (The total was adjusted for those who had returned to school or were deceased, or whose data were uploaded by the PEA to the SAIS system in error.) Interviews were conducted with 6,332 youth, young adults, or their family members or 75.3% of the leavers.

Representativeness

The ADE/ESS used the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Center to calculate the representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of (a) disability type, (b) ethnicity, (c) gender, and (d) exit status (e.g.,

dropout).This calculation determined whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP exiting school during school year 2014–2015. According to the NPSO Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of +/− 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group, and positive differences indicate over-representativeness.

Respondents were representative of all 2014–2015 target leavers based on gender, ethnicity, graduation status, and category of disability. As in previous years, youth who dropped out of school were underrepresented compared to the target leaver group. In FFY15, a -5.4% difference between respondents and the target leavers group existed. This represents a 0.3% decrease over FFY14 in dropouts being underrepresented. ADE/ESS will continue its efforts to increase response rates, especially among youth who drop out. Technical assistance and information highlighting tips provided in the NPSO guidance document for contacting hard-to-reach youth is provided to PEAs during PSO trainings and is also posted on the ADE/ESS PSO website.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	65.00%	-	75.00%	65.00%	-	75.00%	68.00%	-	78.00%	68.00%	-	78.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/Dispute Resolution staff reported on Section 618, Table 7: Dispute Resolution, under Part B of IDEA, to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/Dispute Resolution representatives frequently respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding Table 7 data.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	13	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	22	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
13	22	52.38%	65.00% - 75.00%	59.09%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	72.00%	-	82.00%	72.00%	-	82.00%	74.00%	-	84.00%	74.00%	-	84.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/Dispute Resolution staff reported on Section 618, Table 7: Dispute Resolution, under Part B of IDEA, to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP members represent a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/Dispute Resolution representatives frequently respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding Table 7 data.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	14	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	22	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	46	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
14	22	46	62.86%	72.00% - 82.00%	78.26%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2015

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

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	8.60%	10.80%	12.99%

Key:

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As data and other information became available after the close of the 2015–2016 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group. The SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from the SEAP members regarding indicator data.

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

Overview

Data Analysis

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☐ **Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

Infrastructure Development

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

Technical Assistance and Support

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

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

Selected: Chief State School Officer

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

Name: Alissa Trollinger

Title: Deputy Associate Superintendent / Exceptional Student Services

Email: alissa.trollinger@azed.gov

Phone: 602-364-4004