

**STATE BOARD ADVISORY PANEL  
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The Arizona State Advisory Panel for Special Education held a meeting at the Capitol Center Building, 15 S. 15<sup>th</sup> Ave., Conf. Room A, Phoenix, Arizona, on May 13, 2008, from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

Members Present

Molly Bright  
M. Diane Bruening  
Susan Douglas  
Robert Hill, Ed.S., Co-Chair  
Alecia Jackson  
Gail Jacobs, Ed.D.  
Dr. Ida Malian  
Kathy McDonald  
Terisa Rademacher, Co-chair  
Kim Simmons  
Kay B. Turner, Ed.D, Vice-chairperson  
Nancy Williams

Others Present

Cynthia Bolewski, ADE/ESS  
Colette Chapman, ADE/ESS  
Diane Mignella, ADE/ESS  
Jeannette Zemeida, ADE/ESS

Members Absent

Ronald L. Clanton  
Jay Dashefsky  
Phyllis Green  
Ileen G. Herberg

Minutes Approved (As Read)(As Amended)

Chairperson: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Date

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
1. Call to order.	Teri Rademacher, Co-Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.	1. None.
2. Approval of March 4, 2008 minutes.	Kay Turner made a motion which was seconded by Diane Bruening to approve the minutes, as amended, of the March 4, 2008 meeting. The motion was approved.	2. Motion approved.
3. Public comment.	Robert Hill skipped the call to the public – no public in attendance.	3. None.
4. Exceptional Student Services.	Colette Chapman, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Services (ADE/ESS) informed the Panel that public hearings were held for R7-2-401, R7-2-402, and R7-2-405. There were no public comments.  There were minor changes made to reflect IDEA 2004. Citation changes were made to R7-2-401 and R7-2-402. A change was made to R7-2-405 as it conflicted with IDEA 2004.  The next Public Comment meeting is scheduled for May 19, 2008.  During a phone call to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), ESS was made aware that Arizona needs to add more categories to the LEA determinations. This would include Indicator 9, Racial and Ethnic Disproportionality, and Indicator 10, Racial and Ethnic Disproportionality by Disability. In addition to the current categories ESS uses to determine a label for a PEA the Department will need to add Indicators 9 and 10.  The LEA Determinations are scheduled to be mailed to the LEAs in mid-June. LEAs will have until August to contact the Department with questions related to their data.  Ms. Chapman and a group of ESS Directors met with staff members Wayne Ball and Susan Wagner from Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) on May 8 and 9. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Arizona State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) and solicit unbiased recommendations on what Arizona could be doing better.  Mr. Ball provided Ms. Chapman with a draft of the recommendations. Ms. Chapman will provide a copy of the recommendations to the Panel once the full analysis has been completed. She shared some of the initial recommendations.  Many of the improvement activities in the APR seem to have a disconnect with meeting the requirements of the APR or SPP indicator; or there was no measurement for the results.  Dept. of Education ESS needs to determine activities that are measurable that are	4. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>linked to each SPP indicator.</p> <p>The ADE/ESS needs to ensure that it has good data and demonstrate how the data is used to make decisions about programs. Additionally, ADE/ESS needs to make decisions about how it is going to allocate resources, to accomplish what is listed in the APR.</p> <p>Futher discussion and training needs to occur for PEAs and ESS staff with regard to the indicators of the SPP and the activities that support the indicators.</p> <p>When the State is not meeting its target on indicators, it must be prepared to evaluate what strategies it will take to show improvement and correct or improve the SPP target on the next admission of the APR.</p>	
	<p>If Arizona receives an OSEP rating of "Needs Assistance" next year, OSEP can recommend the technical assistance needed. If Arizona falls into "Needs Intervention" there will be no intervention at that point since a state has to receive this rating for three years before OSEP will take action. Cynthia Bolewski, Director, ADE/ESS, and Ms. Chapman clarified the type of technical assistance that will be provided by OSEP. Ms. Chapman and Ms. Bolewski fielded questions from the Panel.</p>	
	<p>The current N count for disproportionality for Indicators 9 and 10 for over representation is 10 with a weighted risk ratio of <math>\geq 3.0</math>. Using this weighted risk ratio data only, 39 schools in Arizona would be required to divert 15% of their Part B funds to general education. ESS staff discussed this finding with Mr. Ball and Ms. Wagner. They took a look at the data reported in other states. As a result, Arizona will use an N count of 30 with a weighted risk ratio of <math>\geq 4.0</math> to define significant disproportionality for the current year. Using this new formula, only 4 PEAs will be required to divert 15% of their Part B funds.</p>	
	<p>Significant disproportionality does not have to be reported to OSEP in the same way as disproportionate representation. The State has the option to define significant disproportionality differently than disproportionate representation. Significant disproportionality will have an N count of 30 and a weighted risk ratio of 4.0 for FY 2008-2009. Disproportionate representation will have an N count of 30 and a weighted risk ratio of <math>\geq 3.0</math> for over representation and <math>\leq 0.30</math> for under representation.</p>	
	<p>The Director's Institute is scheduled for Sept. 8-12, 2008. One day will be devoted to data collection. Peggy Staples, Data Collection Specialist, ADE/ESS, will be presenting, along with others. The PEAs will be provided copies of their data so that they can ask questions during the presentation.</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>The December 1 Child Count data is now due October 1. Districts will have until December 1 to make sure that they have the correct data reported to ADE.</p> <p>Diane Mignella, Program Support Director, ADE/ESS, spoke to the Panel regarding the ESS monitoring process.</p> <p>In the past all PEAs were monitored on the same line items. Each PEA monitoring is currently focused on its individual indicator data. PEAs are still monitored on a 6-year cycle. However, this is becoming extremely problematic due to the fact that Arizona has more than 600 PEAs, with approximately 12 new charter schools opening each year.</p> <p>More and more states are moving away from the cyclical system. The need to ensure valid and reliable data needs a yearly activity and monitoring is one of the best ways the state has to ensure this. ESS is currently working with Carol Masanari, MPRRC, to brainstorm different approaches to monitoring.</p> <p>ESS specialists are going into schools every year doing site visits gathering data on 60-day timelines, In-By-3 Status, and high school transition items since these are the 100% compliance items. These items are part of the PEA Determination. Arizona PEAs need to improve on the 100% compliance indicators. ESS felt that this would be a proactive way of helping special education directors collect the information. ESS has received some positive feedback from the field.</p> <p>Ms. Mignella outlined some ideas that are being discussed for altering the monitoring process. She asked for Panel member feedback. It was suggested that Arizona look at how other states monitor their schools. It is difficult to compare Arizona to other states however due to the number of charter schools, the mobility of the population and the diversity of the population. MPRRC has provided ESS with information from other states for them to consider. Panel members gave the ESS staff some ideas to consider and discussed the logistical difficulties.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the difficulty of monitoring charter schools when their N count for the special education population is so small. ESS has previously been looking at charter schools under their charter holder entity. In the past ESS may have monitored as many as 20 charter schools under one corporate group. This is no longer possible since the indicator data is what drives the monitoring. ESS staff will now have to look at each charter school separately. In the Phoenix office alone this added an additional 73 PEAs in a 2 month period.</p> <p>Ms. Bolewski informed the Panel that in early April OSEP gave states the opportunity for clarification on the SPP and the APR. Arizona submitted its changes to Indicators 9, 10 and 12</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>on April 11th. Every state, but one, submitted clarification.</p> <p>After submitting the APR and SPP on February 1st Ms. Bolewski and Dr. Lynn Busenbark discovered an error in calculation on the weighted risk ratio for Indicators 9 and 10. Ms. Bolewski explained how the calculation was made and how it was corrected. Panel members were provided with the corrected data.</p> <p>OSEP indicated that there was incomplete data submitted for Indicators 9 and 10. PEAs were identified that had disproportionate representation and Arizona stated that it would investigate them and report on them in the next APR in 2009. OSEP indicated that Arizona must report results for the current year. The PEAs have to be investigated and reported on in the current year. In the corrected information to OSEP, Arizona reported that the identified PEAs are currently doing their self-assessment. However, the issues have identified and will be resolved so that they do not happen in the future. Ms. Bolewski explained how Arizona will identify PEAs who are out of compliance earlier in the fiscal year and the procedures the state will use to get the PEAs into compliance by the February 1 reporting date.</p> <p>OSEP reported that the text for Indicator 12 had to be corrected. This was the In-By-3 indicator. The data did not have to be corrected. A portion of the original text conflicted with Indicator 15 in regards to correcting noncompliance. ESS worked with Valerie Andrews James to correct the text and included activities used to correct the noncompliance.</p> <p>The OSEP response to the corrected APR and SPP is expected in June.</p>	
5. Early Childhood Special Education	Valerie Andrews James was delayed and did not attend the morning portion of the meeting. This item was tabled.	5. None.
6. Special Education Advisory Panel	Ms. Rademacher reported that the Executive Committee would be working with Ms. Chapman to develop a comprehensive list of current SEAP vacancies. SEAP had a question regarding membership in the following categories:  Representatives of Private Schools and Public Charter Schools Representatives from the State Juvenile and Adult Corrections Agencies	6. None.
	<p>The Executive Committee was informed that the Panel will need to add members in the above-listed categories. This will increase the size of the Panel and will also increase the requirement of the special rule regarding the percentage of parents and/or individuals with a disability. The Panel has also lost a few members in recent months.</p> <p>At a previous SEAP meeting Panel members discussed distributing flyers to Raising Special</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
7. Adjournment	<p>Kids and Pilot Parents of Southern Arizona. The flyer needs to be developed. Panel members will also be asked to disseminate the flyers.</p> <p>Ms. Chapman reported that she has received applications for possible nominees for vacant positions.</p> <p>Due to lack of time, the Marketing topic was tabled.</p> <p>Ms. Rademacher informed the Panel that the Executive Committee was developing a timeline for annual SEAP activities. The timeline would pinpoint specific months for scheduled activities. The timeline will include a report from Dispute Resolution, Membership Orientation, Joint SEAP/ICC meeting, etc.</p> <p>The next SEAP meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2008.</p> <p>Proposed agenda items for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Election of Co-Chair (currently filled by Terisa Rademacher)</li><li>• Election of Vice-Chair</li><li>• State Board of Education Membership Approval</li><li>• Annual Report</li><li>• General Supervision overview continued</li><li>• Institutes of Higher Learning report – Dr. Ida Malian</li><li>• Members' Reports from the Field (standing agenda item)</li></ul> <p>The joint meeting for the Joint SEAP/ICC meeting was scheduled for 12:30 – 3:30 pm.</p> <p>Ms. Rademacher adjourned the meeting at 11:30 am.</p>	7. Adjournment.