

**STATE BOARD ADVISORY PANEL
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The Arizona State Advisory Panel for Special Education held a meeting at Arizona Department of Education, Central Office, 2005 N. Central Ave., Room 105, Phoenix, Arizona, on September 25, 2007, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Members Present

M. Diane Bruening
Ronald L. Clanton
Susan Douglas
Phyllis Green
Robert Hill
Kathy McDonald
Terisa Rademacher, Co-chair
Kay B. Turner, Ed.D, Vice-chairperson
Nancy Williams

Others Present

Cynthia Bolewski, ADE/ESS
Lynn Busenbark, ADE/ESS
Colette Chapman, ADE/ESS
Jeannette Zemeida, ADE/ESS

Members Absent

Molly Bright
Jason Geroux
Mattie McVey Lord
Jean Sargent Richards, Ed.D
Kim Simmons

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 9:54 a.m. Meeting start time was delayed due to lack of quorum.	1. None
2. Approval of June 19, 2007 minutes.	Kathy McDonald made a motion and seconded by Ron Clanton to approve the minutes of the June 19, 2007 meeting. During discussion Panel members noted corrections to the minutes. Kathy McDonald amended her motion and it was seconded by Ron Clanton to approve the minutes of the June 19, 2007 meeting as amended.	2. Motion carried
3. Public comment.	Ms. Rademacher welcomed the public in attendance. She explained to those present the procedures for making a comment. Anyone wishing to comment on an agenda item was asked to fill out a brief questionnaire stating which agenda item they wished to comment on. That person would then be called on when that item was discussed.	3. None
4. Exceptional Student Services.	Dr. Lynn Busenbark, Exceptional Student Services (ESS), shared the preliminary data on some of the indicators on the State Performance Plan. Dr. Busenbark stated that the Panel also had another decision to make around Disproportionality issues. Dr. Busenbark reviewed Indicator 5: School-Aged Placements and Indicator 8: Parent Involvement. The State did make the target for Indicator 5. Dr. Busenbark reviewed the Indicator 8 results by ethnicity, district/charter overview, and demographic age. Overall, reporting percentages were close to the special education percentages in each category reported. Indicator 11: Evaluation Timelines – LEAs must do an initial evaluation within 60 days of parental consent. The set baseline was 86% of children were evaluated within 60 days. The target set by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is 100%. In FFY 2006 83% of children met the timeline. Arizona is required to show why districts did not meet the timeline and how this would be corrected. Indicator 13: High School Transition – Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. The baseline was 83.5%. The target (OSEP-mandated) is 100%. The results for FFY 2006 were 57.8%. The reason for low percentage may be that the baseline was set using the IDEA '97 requirements. Monitoring using IDEA '04 has only been in effect for one year and many districts are having trouble setting measurable goals. Indicator 20: Accurate and Timely Data – required for LEA determination. Dr. Busenbark reviewed the chart that Arizona may use to determine if applicable criteria are met. Dr. Busenbark asked the Panel for feedback on the items used on the chart. The focus needs to	4. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>be on the goals that districts find most difficult to meet.</p> <p>Dr. Busenbark asked the Panel about changing the Child Count report date from December 1 to October 1. The change may allow districts more time to get correct data to ADE in time for the Department to accurately report the child count number to OSEP by February 1st.</p> <p>When Arizona wrote the initial SPP and wrote last year's SPP/APR there was some confusion about the distinction between the disproportionality requirements in the regulations. Arizona has to look at placement by ethnicity and placement by ethnicity by disability. The state also has to investigate the procedures and practices for those that show disproportionate representation. Another section of the law talks about significant disproportionality. The subtle reference between those two terms -- disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality – was missed by Dr. Busenbark when submitting the SPP/APR. Apparently it was also missed by the majority of states submitting their reports.</p> <p>With “significant disproportionality” the state has to look at over-representation in identification placement (Least Restrictive Environment [LRE]) and discipline. For the SPP/APR the state has to look at both under- and over-representation for identification. The requirements are almost the same except for one critical difference. In both instances you have to ensure that someone takes a look at the policies, procedures and practices. The one major difference is that if you are looking at significant disproportionality, regardless of what you see in the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices, the state is required to make the LEA use 15% of their IDEA funds in general education. If an LEA is found to have disproportionate representation, and the state investigates their policies, procedures, and practices, the state can give the LEA a pass if they are okay. This approval (pass) does not negate the requirement to divert 15% of their Federal funding for early intervening services.</p> <p>Arizona has a choice of disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality cut points. The state has to set a threshold for each area. It can be the same or it can be different. Dr. Busenbark suggested that SEAP recommend setting the same cut point for both activities so that ESS would only have to look at one group of LEAs. She suggested setting the cut point at 3.0 (based on a weighted-risk ratio). Dr. Busenbark reported that if a cut point of 3.0 were set there would currently be 13 LEAs identified for identification only. Panel discussion followed. Panel members agreed that 3.0 was an acceptable cut point.</p>	5. None.
5. Early Childhood Special Education	Valerie Andrews, Program Director, Early Childhood Special Education reported that ECSE has experienced some staff changes. Karen Woodhouse has left the position of Deputy Associate Superintendent for the Early Childhood Unit and has been replaced by Amy Corriveau. The Unit has also hired Mark Nagasawa from the Osborn School District to fill a Program Specialist position.	5. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>The new IGAs for Child Find and Transition have been completed. The new IGA will address the "In by 3" SPP/APR indicator. Early Childhood will be focusing their training efforts on that this year.</p> <p>A series of trainings have been planned for every region of the state. They are listed at: http://www.ade.az.gov/earlychildhood/ under "Trainings and Conferences". The site also has a link to the Early Childhood Inclusion Coalition.</p>	
6. Special Education Advisory Panel	Ms. Rademacher announced that new members had been appointed to the Panel at the State Board Meeting held September 24, 2007. There will be an Orientation for them November 19, 2007. The new members will be counted on the Panel as of the November 20, 2007 meeting.	6. None.
7. Secure Care – Monitoring and Educational Support	Two Panel members reported that they were leaving the meeting early. As a result, the meeting would lose a quorum at that time. Alissa Trollinger's presentation was cancelled and will be rescheduled at a later meeting.	7. None
8. Medicaid School-Based Claiming	<p>Kay Turner updated the Panel on the recent changes to Medicaid.</p> <p>Dr. Turner was recently informed that as of September 12th, PEAs can no longer claim for paraprofessionals reinforcing therapy goals. This will remove paraprofessionals claiming for behavioral health, speech, occupational therapy, physical therapy and transportation on those days of service. PEAs can continue to claim for paraprofessionals who perform activities related to daily living. Those activities include: toileting, feeding, grooming and wheelchair transfers and the transportation on those days of service. This will cut approximately 35-40 percent of most districts' funds.</p> <p>The reason for the cuts is that AHCCCS (Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System) was recently informed by federal auditors that it does not have this service in their state plan.</p> <p>As of October 1, 2008, federal funds will be cut for transportation and the Medicaid Outreach Program. Panel members were encouraged to send their comments to their legislators. November 6, 2007 is the deadline for comments.</p>	8. None.
9. 2007 OSEP Leadership Conference Update	<p>Ms. Rademacher reported on her experiences at the conference. She also handed out materials to the Panel that she obtained at the conference.</p> <p>Ms. Rademacher attended a breakout session for Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) members with John Copenhaver, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC), as the presenter. She received updated information on the responsibilities and role of state panels.</p>	9. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>Ms. Rademacher reported that it was recommended that Panels incorporate public input procedures into their bylaws. While SEAP does have a public comment component as a standing agenda item, it is recommended that it be included in panel's bylaws. The public input piece should be designed to provide the public-at-large a means to communicate and/or provide input on specific issues. Ms. Rademacher stressed the need to get information about the panel's activities out to the public. The membership discussed the challenges surrounding the dissemination of information.</p> <p>During the breakout, it was stressed that panels need to strive to meet with their counterparts in Part C at least annually. In an effort to make the transition virtually seamless, it is vital that SEAP meet on an annual basis with the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) to promote continued collaboration and identify potential issues that may inhibit this process. The panel discussed targeting the month of March for the joint meeting between SEAP and ICC. It was suggested that SEAP and the ICC alternate hosting the meeting. It was also suggested that SEAP offer to host it every year at the Arizona Department of Education's Office Building on Central Avenue. The actual day of the week could be flexible and sensitive to ICC's schedule of holding their meetings on Fridays.</p> <p>Comments made by other panel members from across the country included an effort by one state to move the meetings throughout the state in an effort to increase participation at their meetings. Ms. Rademacher recalled that SEAP used to rotate meetings between Casa Grande and Phoenix. Eventually, the format was altered so that all meetings were held at ADE on Jefferson to increase accessibility of personnel and paperwork.</p> <p>Panel members in attendance were reminded that part of their responsibilities is to be apprised of the statistics, etc. with regards to Dispute Resolution. Ms. Rademacher will invite Kasey Gregson, the Director of Special Education, to a future meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Copenhaver also suggested that Panels review their previous Annual Report in January. This is to give the Panel a chance to reflect on activities and to review if anything new has emerged since last covering the issues. This will also give the Panel the opportunity to refocus on unresolved issues.</p> <p>The Panel needs to have a clear understanding of what its responsibilities are with the SPP/APR. One of SEAP's obligations is to look at the levels of determination that were handed on to the LEAs and to determine what kind of assistance they might be given to bring those levels of determination up.</p> <p>The Panel discussed expanded use of the SEAP website to generate public input.</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
10. Autism	<p>Ms. Rademacher shared information from a recent MPRRC Teleconference held on September 19, 2007. The topic was Autism and the presenter was Jocelyn Taylor. The call was very informative. At the conclusion of the presentation, State's did not have many questions for Ms. Taylor. The first question was regarding parent requests for specific programs. The response from Ms. Taylor was that not all parent requests can be accommodated; however, the school should explain to the parent where the components that they are requesting are imbedded in their existing programming. Ms. Rademacher asked about sustainability of programs. States and school districts are investing a lot of money to train staff in specific methodologies and then the staff members change jobs or relocate. The turn-over is tremendous in Special Education. Therefore it is important that you build a program, putting a decreased emphasis on developing staff and instead develop a program and/or philosophy. The panel had a discussion on this topic.</p>	10. None.
11. Adjournment	<p>The next SEAP meeting is scheduled for November 20, 2007. The new member orientation is scheduled for November 19, 2007.</p> <p>Proposed agenda items for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• John Copenhaver, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center• Melody Hollinghead, AHCCCS• Alissa Trollinger, ESS, Secure Care <p>Ms. Rademacher adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.</p>	11. Adjournment.