

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Arizona



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

674

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

Programmatic monitoring in Arizona is based on a six-year cycle that balances compliance and results-driven accountability (RDA) with a focus on improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Programmatic monitoring is structured around collaborative conversations and technical assistance (TA) with PEAs. All PEAs were involved in the following activities in the 2022–2023 school year:

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

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

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

During the 2022–2023 school year, ADE/ESS continued the implementation of its yearly review of data related to special education. Compliance and results indicator data, PEA determinations, and annual site visit data continue to be reviewed annually by ADE/ESS assigned program specialists in collaboration with PEA directors. The system supports practices that improve educational results for students with disabilities by using multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance and by encouraging and supporting improvement through targeted TA and professional development.

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

Finally, grant allocations, funding administration, and fiscal compliance are facilitated by the ADE/ESS Operations unit. This unit coordinates fiscal tracking, grant awards, and distribution of federal funds. These activities are augmented by the SEA's Grants Management section, which provides single audit functions, distributes cash payments, applies federal funding holds, and compiles fiscal reports when PEAs finish a project period. The SEA Grants Management section and ADE/ESS Operations unit teams work collaboratively to leverage appropriate practices in order for PEAs to be compliant with the IDEA.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The ADE/ESS technical assistance system involves providing information and guidance on promising practices in educating students with disabilities and furnishing information and guidance on the IDEA and Arizona's regulations and policies. This assistance is provided by all IDEA-funded ADE areas and takes place during onsite visits, regional meetings, conferences, and other events. Electronic and virtual professional development and technical assistance are provided via email, through the consultant of the day (COD) telephone line, and via virtual software and meeting platforms. Technical

assistance materials are found throughout the ADE/ESS website, <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation>, including the Arizona Technical Assistance System (AZ-TAS) documents web page, <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/az-tas-documents>, and on the ADE/ESS Promising Practices website, <https://www.azpromisingpractices.com/>.

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 children with disabilities.

Please see the Professional Development System link for an explanation of Arizona's Technical Assistance and Professional Development System. <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/professional-learning/>

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

71

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

In FFY 2022, parent members of the State Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) participated in four sessions to receive updated information on the SPP/APR indicators. SEAP meetings were offered either in person or virtually in order to accommodate schedules. During these sessions, parents received information on each indicator's historical and current data, progress against targets, as well as updates on improvement strategies. Time was set aside at each meeting to answer questions and to solicit feedback from all SEAP members, including parents.

Three virtual presentations were held with parent members from Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. In an effort to gain broad representation, the sessions were advertised on RSK's website and social media platforms. The meetings were scheduled in the evenings, using a virtual platform to attract parents who have busy day schedules or limited time. For those who registered, RSK staff sent a text reminder the day before and on the day of the meeting. To increase representation, a Spanish-language interpreter was available at each forum.

During these sessions, parents were informed that stakeholder feedback is an ongoing process and that, while we were not soliciting feedback on target setting as we did in FFY 2020, the objective of the meetings was to give updates on the State's performance against the current targets as well as to solicit feedback. To meet this objective, the presenter gave a simplified definition of each indicator along with how it could relate to the day-to-day life of a parent of a child with a disability. To deepen their understanding, the presenter described how the SPP/APR could be seen as analogous to their child's IEP. For example, both documents include measurable goals, and progress is reported on those goals at specific times during the year. To assist parents in analyzing year-over-year trends, they were shown graphs depicting historical as well as current data and encouraged to ask questions regarding their observations. Updates on any improvement strategies related to specific indicators were given as well as information on how parents can access up-to-date progress on the SPP/APR via the ADE/ESS website. Finally, parents were shown where to locate the public comment page if they would like to provide additional feedback.

The evening Zoom sessions were scheduled at a specific time, which did not allow some parents with scheduling conflicts to attend. To increase the number of diverse parents engaged in SPP/APR discussions, ADE/ESS is in the process of exploring different platforms for both live and asynchronous meetings. In addition, ADE/ESS is taking steps to increase its outreach through an improved SPP/APR website. The website aims to create an inviting way for parents to build their knowledge of the indicators in an easy-to-understand format that will use less technical jargon, more infographics, and uncomplicated charts in order to build parents' capacity to understand the significance of the SPP/APR and Arizona's progress related to its indicators.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The State conducted activities at stakeholder meetings to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. Activities included listening to a presentation, participating during the presentation, and providing feedback after the presentation. The State sought out a diverse group of parents by partnering with Arizona's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center, Raising Special Kids (RSK). RSK posted information in both English and Spanish on various social media platforms and used its website as a source for parents to learn about upcoming training opportunities.

At the meetings, the State described the historical and current initiatives related to each indicator. To build parent support of these initiatives, time was set aside at each meeting to ensure that parents understood the specific activities the State was taking to improve the outcomes of children with disabilities. For each indicator, the lead facilitator gave an introduction, then ADE/ESS panel members led conversations regarding past and current initiatives. Collaboration and participation were encouraged in order to provide a safe platform for the parents' voices to be heard. Parents were informed that the State continues to seek feedback, since stakeholder engagement is an ongoing process. Parents were shown where to locate the public comment page on the ADE/ESS, if they want to provide relevant feedback.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Target Setting:

Though new targets were not being set this year, stakeholders were engaged in the ongoing effort of measuring progress against the current targets in the SPP/APR.

Analyzing Data:

Data was visually depicted in graphs displaying historical and current trends that guided the presenter and audience to discuss possible reasons the data moved closer or farther from its intended target. Stakeholders were encouraged to ask questions and to provide ideas for further analysis.

Developing Improvement Strategies:

Stakeholders were given an update on current improvement strategies related to specific indicators and provided ideas and examples of activities that could support the improvement of outcomes.

Evaluating Progress:

ADE/ESS is in the process of building a more robust SPP/APR section on its website in an effort to create a user-friendly interface that allows for better understanding of the indicators. One of the latest additions is a document that lists indicators 1 through 16 in a table of contents. Selecting one of these indicators connects the user to a two-page summary that includes its definition, data source, measurement, graph, and data table. The graph displays 10 years of data and targets, which can help stakeholders to understand historical trends as well as future goals. The accompanying data table below each graph lists the population sizes, to give stakeholders a better understanding of the actual numbers behind the calculated percentages. The ADE/ESS website also houses videos of recorded special education advisory meetings that contain information about how progress is evaluated. Materials used in these meetings, including PowerPoint slides and handouts, are posted next to the videos. To solicit input on an ongoing basis, an opportunity for public comment is available at <https://specialeducationpubliccommentform.azed.gov/PublicComment/>.

The following meetings were conducted in FFY 2022 to provide ongoing communication with stakeholders regarding the SPP/APR.

- September 27, 2022: The State presented Indicators 11 and 13 to SEAP
- November 15, 2022: The State presented Indicators 5, 6, 8, and 13 to SEAP
- December 1, 2022: The State presented Indicators 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 to RSK
- December 15, 2022: The State presented Indicators 4, 9, 10, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 13 to Special Education Professionals Forum
- January 9, 2023: The State presented Indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, and 14 to RSK
- January 18, 2023: The State presented Indicators 15, 16, and 17 to RSK
- January 19, 2023: The State presented Indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, 14, 15, 16, and 17 to Special Education Professionals Forum
- January 24, 2023: The State presented Indicators 3, 7, and 17 to SEAP
- March 29, 2023: The State presented Indicators 9 and 10 to SEAP

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

A detailed breakdown of each indicator's progress against the targets set in the SPP/APR is available on the ADE/ESS website, <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/sppapr/>. This document is located under the section titled Understanding the SPP/APR. It is titled Arizona's Progress on the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicators.

A document describing the process of how stakeholder feedback was used to determine the FFY 2020–FFY 2025 targets and a document of public comments regarding targets and improvement strategies are available on the ADE/ESS website, <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/sppapr/>, under the list titled Public Reporting of SPP/APR Targets and Comments.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The following URL is the Arizona SPP/APR web page: <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/sppapr/>

The annual performance report (APR) on the State's progress and/or slippage for FFY 2021 is available on the website listed above. It is located in a list under the section titled State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) and is titled SPP/APR FFY 2021.

The ADE reports annually on the performance of each PEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR no later than 120 days following the State's APR submission on the OSEP required submission date, generally on February 1, at the website listed above. It is located under the list titled State and PEA Performance by Indicator.

The SPP/APR is disseminated to the public by means of the ADE/ESS website. The ESS special education email listserv, ESS and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) specialists, trainings, and conferences serve as the vehicles to notify parents, the PEAs, and the public of the availability of the SPP/APR.

Special Education Monitoring Alerts, <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/monitoring-alerts/>, memoranda pertaining to specific topics, including the SPP/APR, are sent to the ADE/ESS special education email listserv and filed electronically online.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Sources and Actions of Technical Assistance (TA) for the FFY 2022 submission are listed below.

Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)

- Analyzed Arizona's statutes and board rules related to posted questions while providing feedback to national peers.

Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Center

- Planned and presented at monthly State Steering Committee meetings with educator preparation program partners.
- Developed blueprint goals to increase the capacity for institutions of higher education (IHE).
- Provided updates on certification and program approval to Educator Preparation Program (EPP) partners.
- Attended and presented at national CEEDAR Convening on the High Leverage Practices in Special Education Book Study.

Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

- Content and resources were shared in ESS PBIS trainings for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions on a PBIS resource webpage and during a sustainability webinar series.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and DaSy (Data Systems)

- Used data to analyze state performance (DaSy literacy initiative).
- Supported Arizona to understand outcomes, transition issues, and strategies for inclusion.

ECPC (Early Childhood Personnel (and Equity) Center)

- Leadership Academy supported one of our staff members to develop the leadership skills needed for the 619 Coordinator position.

IDEA Data Center (IDC)

- Attended the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Data Quality Peer Group, disseminating information that allowed us to calibrate the SSIP report to expectations properly.
- The IDC review team provided valuable and specific feedback on several of Arizona's Indicators for the SPP/APR narrative, which allowed us to exhibit our effort in Arizona for students with disabilities properly.
- Attended the IDC SPP/APR Summit and IDC Interactive Institute, which increased understanding of the indicators and techniques for gathering stakeholder feedback and measuring significant disproportionality.

National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI)

- Content and resources were shared in ESS PBIS trainings for Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 Teams and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Coaches and in Arizona's PBIS network advisory meetings.

National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) Community of Practice

- Conducted analysis of factors that impact the 1% threshold for alternate assessment participation rates and provided training to address participation decisions and assessment participation for all students.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)

- The Arizona State Director met monthly with the NCSI State Director Mentor to discuss local policy needs, communication, and resource strategies and to connect with other SEAs with similar needs or challenges. Discussed and received feedback on the implementation of the SEA General Supervision system.
- Shared resources related to Universal Design for Learning (UDL), the National Center on Accessible Educational Materials (AEM), the IES Practice Guides for Literacy and Mathematics, and evidence-based practices with Exceptional Student Services professional learning providers.
- Applied knowledge learned to cross-agency connections and collaborations to support agency cohesion and to enhance connections between the SSIP and the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG).
- Aligned our focus for professional learning and TA to the Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) 2.0 in an "if-then" statement to build a clear focus for our work driven by data, outcomes, and how we can start making connections with data/outcomes/needs with our monitoring cycle.
- Used the Hexagon Tool to evaluate past and prospective behavior/mental health projects for effective and strategic project implementation in schools.
- Engaged in the development of a national UDL document that outlines key outputs that show evidence of each UDL guideline in action so that the impact of UDL can be measured.
- Collaborative meetings with other SEA teams regarding building coherence to a professional learning strategic planning process.
- The Medium States Directors Discussion Group met quarterly with similar-sized SEA leadership to discuss current special education issues, General Supervision system development, OSEP guidance, and leadership development that focus on improving results for students with disabilities.
- The NCSI State Education Agency Leadership (SEAL) Collaborative allowed for information-sharing and problem-solving to support planning, implementation, and continuous improvement of initiatives that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Content focused on leading within situational contexts to support instructional leadership and the use of evidence-based practices for students with disabilities while ensuring effective general supervision for IDEA implementation.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI): Results-Based Accountability and Support (RBAS) Group

- Reviewed reporting requirements and programmatic monitoring requirements to ensure alignment with OSEP.
- A variety of resource documentation and training webinars were attended by the teams to ensure proper implementation of monitoring systems aligned to DMS and APR reporting requirements.

National Deaf Center (NDC)

- Attended collaborative meetings with other SEA teams regarding building comprehensive pre-employment transitions services (Pre-ETS) and career and technical education (CTE) programs for students who are deaf/hard of hearing.

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT:C)

- Used information presented through NTACT:C to update, develop, and deliver professional learning specific to secondary transition.
- Developed resources and best practice models for transition and Post School Outcomes data collection.

- Collaborated in meetings with Arizona's Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) and CTE unit to coordinate Statewide Professional Learning Opportunities.
- Completed an eight-week online course pertaining to learning opportunities for Indicator 13 stakeholders and special education teachers/staff.
- Attended meetings with other SEA teams regarding the collection, disaggregation, analysis, and dissemination efforts for local, statewide, and national post school outcomes data.
- Attended meetings to support best practice delivery. Topics included dropout prevention, how to best facilitate the PSO focus group, respondent eligibility for the PSO survey, and resources to enhance TA for IEP teams.
- Worked with other SEA teams regarding interagency collaborative efforts around increasing access to VR and CTE programs for students with disabilities.

PROGRESS Center

- ESS Math Specialists attended the "Prepping for Progress" event. Sessions provided during this conference helped the Math Specialists to refine their knowledge and understanding of specially designed instruction. Knowledge gained was integrated into professional learning provided for educators in Arizona.

Raising Special Kids (RSK)

- Met monthly with the Executive Director and staff of RSK, Arizona's parent training and information center, to discuss parent and family engagement, collaborate on current special education issues, support communication to parents with plain language information, and facilitate feedback from parents and families regarding special education data, goals, and strategies.
- Partnered to provide webinars specifically for parents and families with disabilities regarding the SPP/APR to increase understanding and facilitate feedback.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, 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.

On July 3, 2018, OSEP issued findings in its monitoring report, which are not fully resolved. Longstanding noncompliance (from any unresolved finding identified by OSEP during and prior to FFY 2021) may be a factor in the Department's 2025 determinations. OSEP will work with the State to clarify what actions remain.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, 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.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	77.38%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	75.60%	77.38%	77.88%
Data	66.40%	67.65%	68.98%	81.84%	72.41%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.38%	78.88%	79.38%	79.88%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	7,110

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	21
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,501

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7,110	9,632	72.41%	78.38%	73.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Conditions to Graduate with a Regular Diploma

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

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

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

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

In addition to the required credits for graduation, Arizona has a testing requirement. A civics test has been required since the graduating class of 2017. High school graduates are required to pass (60/100) a civics test identical to the civics portion of the naturalization test used by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. A student with a disability is not required to pass the civics test to graduate from high school unless he or she is learning at a level appropriate for the pupil's grade level in a specific academic area and unless a passing score on the statewide assessment or the civics test is specifically required in a specific academic area by the pupil's individualized education program (IEP), as mutually agreed on by the pupil's parents and the pupil's IEP team or the pupil, if the pupil is at least eighteen years of age.

- Passing the ACT statewide assessment is not a state requirement for graduation; however, local schools may choose to develop their academic requirements related to the AASA assessment.
- The local governing board of each district or charter school is responsible for developing a course of study and graduation requirements for all students placed in special education programs (Arizona Administrative Code R7-2-302 (6)). Students placed in special education, grades 9 through 12, are eligible to receive a high school diploma upon completion of the graduation requirements. The conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma are the same as the conditions all youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.
- Algebra II requirement may be modified using a Personal Curriculum, as outlined in R7-2-302.03

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	22.39%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	27.70%	26.80%	25.90%	22.39%	21.89%
Data	23.46%	21.93%	22.33%	18.03%	27.24%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	21.39%	20.89%	20.39%	19.89%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	7,110
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	21
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,501

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,501	9,632	27.24%	21.39%	25.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Arizona uses the same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to describe what counts as dropping out for all youths. A dropout between the ages of 14 and 21 is defined as an individual who meets all of the following:

- 1) was publicly enrolled in special education at the start of the reporting period but was not in special education at the end of the reporting year
- 2) was not indicated as transferring to regular education
- 3) was not indicated as moving out of a public education organization's purview and continuing in another non-public educational program
- 4) did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - Presumed to be continuing in special education as reported by the public education agency at the end of the year
 - Graduated with a high school diploma
 - Reached the maximum age for special education
 - Died

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	89.54%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	84.24%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	67.59%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	89.68%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	84.55%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	68.33%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	11,429	10,348	8,587
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	9,778	8,845	2,770
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	385	264	3,722
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	802	781	704

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	11,429	10,348	8,587
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	10,033	9,000	3,004
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	357	228	4,108
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	801	785	702

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,965	11,429	97.57%	95.00%	95.94%	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	9,890	10,348	95.15%	95.00%	95.57%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	7,196	8,587	85.73%	95.00%	83.80%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

High school participation dropped 1.93 percentage points from 85.73% in FFY 2021 to 83.80% in FFY 2022. The high school general assessment for ELA is the ACT, which consists of an English test, a reading test, and a writing essay. All of these measures contribute to the overall ELA participation rate, and if one of the "subtests" is not completed/submitted, it could be that the student is not counted as having participated.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11,191	11,429	97.59%	95.00%	97.92%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,013	10,348	95.22%	95.00%	96.76%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	7,814	8,587	85.66%	95.00%	91.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The location (URL) of public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR § 300.160(f) is <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data/>. On the linked page, open the "State Assessment Results" tab.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state performed the required action.

3A - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2022 data represent slippage from the FFY 2021 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2022 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	16.35%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	6.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	4.74%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	13.62%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	4.53%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	3.48%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	17.35%	17.85%	18.35%	18.85%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	6.60%	6.90%	7.20%	7.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	5.14%	5.34%	5.54%	5.74%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	14.70%	15.24%	15.78%	16.32%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.19%	5.52%	5.85%	6.18%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.92%	4.14%	4.36%	4.58%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations,

participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	10,163	9,109	6,492
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,532	667	176
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	11	300

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	10,390	9,228	7,112
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,581	505	141
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	5	201

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,556	10,163	15.45%	17.35%	15.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	678	9,109	6.39%	6.60%	7.44%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	476	6,492	9.50%	5.14%	7.33%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,605	10,390	15.20%	14.70%	15.45%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	510	9,228	5.25%	5.19%	5.53%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	342	7,112	8.26%	3.92%	4.81%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The location (URL) of public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR § 300.160(f) is <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data/>. On the linked page, open the "State Assessment Results" tab.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2023 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state performed the required action.

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	34.81%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	38.37%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	45.41%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	48.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	46.91%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	49.08%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	36.23%	36.94%	37.65%	38.36%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	39.97%	40.77%	41.57%	42.37%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	46.61%	47.21%	47.81%	48.41%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	49.20%	49.70%	50.20%	50.70%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	48.31%	49.01%	49.71%	50.41%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	50.08%	50.58%	51.08%	51.58%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	802	781	704
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	261	277	309

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	801	785	702
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	368	394	324

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	261	802	32.67%	36.23%	32.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	277	781	35.82%	39.97%	35.47%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	309	704	47.42%	46.61%	43.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022, the percentage of high school children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards decreased from 47.42% to 43.89%, and Arizona did not reach its target of 46.61%.

A possible explanation for the decrease in proficiency for high school students (Grade 11) could be related to COVID-19. Looking more closely at this student group and when they were included in the data, FFY 2022 data is comprised of students who were completing Grade 8 when COVID-19 shut schools down for Quarter 4 of SY 2019–2020. Due to the school closures, there were no assessments that spring, so these students had not taken a statewide assessment since Grade 7 in SY 2018–2019. This is the first opportunity we would see COVID impacts for this cohort. In addition to the school closure during their last quarter of Grade 8, this cohort's Grade 9 instruction was predominately either hybrid or online. Differences in the previous cohort proficiency levels could be explained by an additional year of traditional instruction between testing years.

The reason these students may have fallen short of the target is that the targets were projected from the FFY 2020 baseline data. Assessment data in FFY 2020 was when we had fewer students in in-person instruction and, thus, fewer students participating in alternate assessments. The most medically fragile students were receiving instruction online only in FFY 2020 but may have returned to the classroom in FFY 2021.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	368	801	48.47%	49.20%	45.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	394	785	44.86%	48.31%	50.19%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	324	702	45.63%	50.08%	46.15%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The location (URL) of public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR § 300.160(f) is <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data/>. On the linked page, open the "State Assessment Results" tab.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	29.36
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	29.07
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	28.13
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	21.50
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	22.39
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	23.50

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	28.36	27.86	27.36	26.86
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	28.07	27.57	27.07	26.57
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	27.63	27.38	27.13	26.88
Math	A <=	Grade 4	20.50	20.00	19.50	19.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	21.39	20.89	20.39	19.89
Math	C <=	Grade HS	23.00	22.75	22.50	22.25

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This

organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	80,483	84,983	77,260
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,163	9,109	6,492
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35,970	30,867	29,667
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	49	22	1,037
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,532	667	176
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	11	300

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	81,220	85,675	79,429
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,390	9,228	7,112
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	31,541	23,128	24,163
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	42	9	821
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,581	505	141
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	5	201

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot

assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.31%	44.75%	28.76	28.36	29.44	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.44%	36.35%	29.35	28.07	28.90	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	7.33%	39.74%	32.81	27.63	32.41	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	15.45%	38.89%	23.89	20.50	23.44	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	5.53%	27.01%	21.68	21.39	21.48	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.81%	31.45%	35.96	23.00	26.65	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	40.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	35.00%
Data	0.00%	19.44%	31.03%	Not Valid and Reliable	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

733

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4	6	Not Valid and Reliable	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	Did not meet target	N/A

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

Arizona defines significant discrepancy as the percentage of PEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs in comparison to the State rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

The minimum cell size is >= 10 students with IEPs with expulsion or out of school suspension (OSS) >10 days in the PEA.

The minimum n size is >= 30 students with IEPs cumulatively enrolled in the PEA.

The formula used is the rate ratio = (PEA students with IEPs rate for expulsion or OSS > 10 Days)/(State students with IEPs rate for expulsion or OSS > 10 Days). The PEA threshold score is a rate ratio of >= 3.0 for one year.

Methodology: The percentage of PEAs with a significant discrepancy was determined including only PEAs that had >= 10 students with IEPs with expulsion or OSS >10 days (cell size) and at least 30 children with disabilities cumulatively enrolled (n size).

There were 6 PEAs that met both criteria. Of the 6 PEAs included for analysis, there were 4 that met the rate ratio of >= 3.0 for one year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State reviewed the PEAs’ data from the significant discrepancy calculation and identified 4 PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. Arizona required the identified PEAs to maintain special education policies and procedures in compliance with all regulatory requirements before Part B IDEA Entitlement funds could be approved by ADE/ESS. ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits to validate the policies and procedures made by the PEAs during a programmatic monitoring. Upon completion of the reviews, Arizona determined whether the PEAs complied with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

The State must provide the required baseline and targets for FFY 2022 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In December 2022, the SEA issued a memo announcing a change in discipline data collection from a separate special education software application (ESS Discipline Data System) to the statewide student information system, AzEDS, beginning in school year (SY) 2024. The SEA also announced that beginning in SY 2024, any instance in which a PEA removes a child from his or her educational environment for disciplinary purposes must be reported into AzEDS, including the violation and action taken by the PEA.

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/12/Discipline%20Data%20Submissions%20Memorandum.pdf>

Finally, the SEA will require PEAs to submit discipline data for students who are reassigned to an alternative education program as an alternative to a suspension or expulsion or who are placed into an alternative to a suspension program (ARS 15-841). This way, the agency can clearly report all scenarios of removal from educational environments for federal reporting. Data collection for SY 2024 and beyond will be conducted as outlined in the following memo: <https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/12/221229%20-%20Discipline%20Data%20for%20Students%20with%20Disabilities.pdf>.

The SEA provided professional development in March 2023 and continuous technical assistance to support these data collection and reporting changes for school years 2022, 2023, and 2024.

4A - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the data reported does not meet the SPP/APR Indicator 4A measurement and instructions as well as the requirements of the IDEA section 618 discipline data collection, the data source for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, "...beginning in SY 2024, any instance in which a PEA removes a child from his or her educational environment for disciplinary purposes must be reported into AzEDS, including the violation and action taken by the PEA." Until this change to the State's data collection takes effect, the Indicator 4A data reported by the State does not include all data consistent with the reporting requirements for the indicator and the underlying IDEA section 618 discipline data collection. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. OSEP recognizes the multi-year effort by the State to address the data collection concerns that OSEP first raised in response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR and subsequently the FFY 2021 SPP/APR; the State indicated that it anticipates the changes to its discipline will take effect beginning in school year 2024.

Additionally, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4A - Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Not Valid and Reliable	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

736

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	3	Not Valid and Reliable	0%	Not Valid and Reliable	Met target	N/A

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Arizona defines significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity as the number of PEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs by race/ethnicity in comparison to the State rate for all students with IEPs with expulsion or out of school suspension (OSS) > 10 days. The PEA minimum cell size is >= 10 students with disabilities with expulsion or suspension of OSS >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group in the PEA.

The PEA minimum n size is >= 30 students with disabilities in the same specific racial/ethnic group cumulatively enrolled in the PEA.

The formula used is the rate ratio (PEA students with IEPs rate for expulsion or OSS by race/ethnicity > 10 Days)/(State students with IEPs rate for expulsion or OSS > 10 Days).

The PEA threshold score is a rate ratio of >= 3.0 for one year.

Methodology: The number of PEAs with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity was determined using only PEAs that had both one subgroup >= 10 students with disabilities with expulsion or OSS >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup (cell size) and the 30 students with disabilities in the same ethnic or racial subgroup cumulatively enrolled in the PEA.

There were 3 PEAs that met the criteria and comprised the number of PEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size. Of the 3 PEAs meeting the minimum cell and n size, all 3 met the rate ratio of >= 3.0 for one year and were classified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State reviewed the PEAs' data from the significant discrepancy calculation and identified 3 PEAs as having a significant discrepancy. Arizona required the identified PEAs to maintain special education policies and procedures in compliance with all regulatory requirements before Part B IDEA Entitlement funds could be approved by ADE/ESS. ADE/ESS specialists conduct on-site visits and/or desk audits to validate the policies and procedures made by the PEAs during a programmatic monitoring. Upon completion of the reviews, Arizona determined whether the PEAs complied with IDEA requirements that pertain to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In December 2022, the SEA issued a memo announcing a change in discipline data collection from a separate special education software application (ESS Discipline Data System) to the statewide student information system, AzEDS, beginning in school year (SY) 2024. The SEA also announced that beginning in SY 2024, any instance in which a PEA removes a child from his or her educational environment for disciplinary purposes must be reported into AzEDS, including the violation and action taken by the PEA.

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/12/Discipline%20Data%20Submissions%20Memorandum.pdf>

Finally, the SEA will require PEAs to submit discipline data for students who are reassigned to an alternative education program as an alternative to a suspension or expulsion or who are placed into an alternative to a suspension program (ARS 15-841). This way, the agency can clearly report all scenarios of removal from educational environments for federal reporting. Data collection for SY 2024 and beyond will be conducted as outlined in the following memo: <https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/12/221229%20-%20Discipline%20Data%20for%20Students%20with%20Disabilities.pdf>.

The SEA provided professional development in March 2023 and continuous technical assistance to support these data collection and reporting changes for school years 2022, 2023, and 2024.

4B - OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the data reported does not meet the SPP/APR Indicator 4B measurement and instructions as well as the requirements of the IDEA section 618 discipline data collection, the data source for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, "...beginning in SY 2024, any instance in which a PEA removes a child from his or her educational environment for disciplinary purposes must be reported into AzEDS, including the violation and action taken by the PEA." Until this change to the State's data collection takes effect, the Indicator 4B data reported by the State does not include all data consistent with the reporting requirements for the indicator and the underlying IDEA section 618 discipline data collection. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target. OSEP recognizes the multi-year effort by the State to address the data collection concerns that OSEP first raised in response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR and subsequently the FFY 2021 SPP/APR; the State indicated that it anticipates the changes to its discipline will take effect beginning in school year 2024.

In addition, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4B- Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	65.00%	65.50%	67.00%	68.05%	68.84%
A	68.03%	Data	66.57%	66.93%	68.03%	68.05%	68.73%
B	2019	Target <=	14.70%	14.50%	13.90%	13.70%	13.58%
B	13.69%	Data	14.19%	14.00%	13.69%	13.70%	13.62%
C	2019	Target <=	2.00%	1.90%	1.90%	2.76%	2.70%
C	2.52%	Data	2.33%	2.48%	2.52%	2.76%	2.68%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	69.63%	70.42%	71.21%	72.00%
Target B <=	13.46%	13.34%	13.22%	13.10%
Target C <=	2.64%	2.58%	2.52%	2.46%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	140,987
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	97,178
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	19,330
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	3,377
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	94
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	249

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	97,178	140,987	68.73%	69.63%	68.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	19,330	140,987	13.62%	13.46%	13.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,720	140,987	2.68%	2.64%	2.64%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	51.50%	52.00%	55.00%	27.23%	28.53%
A	Data	54.09%	54.75%	30.23%	27.23%	30.87%
B	Target <=	44.20%	44.00%	38.60%	63.36%	61.86%
B	Data	39.93%	38.80%	60.42%	63.36%	60.33%
C	Target <=				0.64%	0.62%
C	Data				0.64%	0.38%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations,

participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	30.23%
B	2019	60.42%
C	2020	0.64%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	29.83%	31.13%	32.43%	33.73%
Target B <=	60.36%	58.86%	57.36%	55.86%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.59%	0.57%	0.54%	0.52%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,296	5,082	446	8,824
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	1,064	1,872	172	3,108
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,915	2,665	237	4,817
b2. Number of children attending separate school	53	54	3	110
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	5	10	0	15

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,108	8,824	30.87%	29.83%	35.22%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,927	8,824	60.33%	60.36%	55.84%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	15	8,824	0.38%	0.59%	0.17%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2017	Target >=	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%	61.70%	62.95%
A1	67.93%	Data	67.93%	65.86%	63.19%	61.70%	59.80%

A2	2017	Target >=	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	42.80%	44.50%
A2	50.36%	Data	50.36%	49.77%	42.96%	42.80%	51.14%
B1	2017	Target >=	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	63.37%	64.57%
B1	67.20%	Data	67.20%	69.73%	61.28%	63.37%	60.25%
B2	2017	Target >=	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	48.88%	49.78%
B2	48.88%	Data	48.88%	50.08%	40.47%	44.46%	43.89%
C1	2017	Target >=	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	62.79%	64.04%
C1	56.26%	Data	56.26%	63.93%	62.77%	62.79%	58.17%
C2	2017	Target >=	68.50%	69.00%	69.50%	36.93%	38.33%
C2	42.64%	Data	42.64%	43.60%	36.93%	36.93%	52.97%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	64.20%	65.45%	66.70%	67.95%
Target A2 >=	46.20%	47.90%	49.60%	51.30%
Target B1 >=	65.77%	66.97%	68.17%	69.37%
Target B2 >=	50.68%	51.58%	52.48%	53.38%
Target C1 >=	65.29%	66.54%	67.79%	69.04%
Target C2 >=	39.73%	41.13%	42.53%	43.93%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,313

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	43	1.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,279	29.65%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	778	18.04%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,143	26.50%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,070	24.81%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,921	3,243	59.80%	64.20%	59.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,213	4,313	51.14%	46.20%	51.31%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	18	0.42%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,433	33.23%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	899	20.84%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,114	25.83%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	849	19.68%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,013	3,464	60.25%	65.77%	58.11%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,963	4,313	43.89%	50.68%	45.51%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	105	2.43%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,262	29.26%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	574	13.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,289	29.89%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,083	25.11%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,863	3,230	58.17%	65.29%	57.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,372	4,313	52.97%	39.73%	55.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B1	Arizona's Outcome 7B1 target for students in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR is 65.19%. The State did not meet this target and slipped from the FFY 2021 rate of 60.24% to 58.11%. Due to recent changes in staffing of the 619 Coordinator, ADE has encountered time constraints in conducting a root-cause analysis. However, initial findings suggest that COVID-19 may be a contributing factor. The children who exited in FY 2024 entered preschool at age three when schools were temporarily closed due to the pandemic, which limited in-person services and instruction. The schools reopened when these children were age four. When comparing the FY 2024 cohort to the FY 2023 cohort, students in the FY 2023 cohort attended preschool at age three, the schools closed when they were four, and reopened when they were five. This cohort included earlier interventions that allowed for more progress, whereas the lack of services and instruction at age three in the FY 2024 cohort may have contributed to the decrease in test scores in the area of knowledge and skills acquisition.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

NO

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	91.47%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021

Target >=	63.00%	65.00%	67.00%	91.47%	91.87%
Data	92.84%	92.87%	93.04%	91.47%	91.31%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	92.27%	92.67%	93.07%	93.47%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
20,002	21,668	91.31%	92.27%	92.31%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Every parent who has a child with an IEP has the opportunity to complete the survey using the web-based data collection system. Thus, a census of parents of preschool- and school-age children may complete the survey. The survey completed by parents of children with an IEP in preschool is the same survey completed by parents of children with an IEP in all age groups. Sharing the same questions for all age groups supports the State's ability to combine the data confidently and generalize the results to its overall target population.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

150,316

Percentage of respondent parents

14.41%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	14.63%	14.41%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness is +/- 3%, which is the discrepancy in the proportion of respondents compared to the target group. Parents were given a specific code to ensure that reliable demographic information was collected. That code was linked directly to the school's Student Information System (SIS). Upon entering the code into the parent survey, only the questions related to the parent survey are shown on the screen. All other information, such as demographic information, was stored within the survey. The State extracted a report from the survey and reviewed the demographic information relating to the parent's child's age and race/ethnicity. The State specifically analyzed this information to determine if there was a +/- 3% discrepancy. The State found that the race/ethnicity were representative within +/- 3% of the children receiving special education services in Arizona.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The FFY 2022 response rate by race and ethnicity is listed in the table below.

Race/Ethnicity	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.10%	5.16%	-0.06
Asian	1.76%	1.41%	+0.35
Black or African American	4.86%	6.38%	-1.52
Hispanic/Latino	47.32%	47.09%	+0.23
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.20%	0.28%	-0.08
Two or More	3.69%	4.15%	-0.46
White	37.07%	35.52%	+1.55

The FFY 2021 response rate by race and ethnicity is listed in the table below.

Race/Ethnicity	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.56%	5.26%	-0.70
Asian	1.66%	1.36%	+0.30

Black or African American	4.76%	6.31%	-1.55
Hispanic/Latino	48.23%	46.77%	+1.46
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.18%	0.28%	-0.10
Two or More	3.86%	3.93%	-0.07
White	36.84%	36.09%	+0.75

The FFY 2022 response rate by the age of the child is listed in the table below.

Age of Child	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
Ages 3–5	11.04%	10.06%	+0.98
Ages 6–13	59.10%	59.49%	-0.39
Ages 14–22	29.87%	30.45%	-0.58

The FFY 2021 response rate by the age of the child is listed in the table below.

Age of Child	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
Ages 3–5	10.33%	9.63%	+0.70
Ages 6–13	60.20%	59.49%	+0.71
Ages 14–22	29.47%	30.88%	-1.41

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In an effort to increase response rates year over year, ADE/ESS has created an online portal for PEAs to self-monitor the number of parents who have completed the survey. This portal allows the coordinator to view any discrepancies between the response rates of various subgroups in the State. For example, if one or more subgroups is out of proportion to the target group, the coordinator can work with specific PEAs on plans to increase the response rates among underrepresented groups. While Arizona’s data is representative based on our state defined metric, this strategy can be targeted toward subgroups where there has been relative underrepresentation, specifically students who are black and students in ages 14–22. To increase the response rate, the coordinator will assist PEAs by sending out emails to parents during the period that the survey is open.

ADE/ESS also collaborates with Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. RSK delivers consistent notices in its weekly e-newsletter and direct parent contact through workshops and personalized consultation. To increase the response rate, particularly for underrepresented populations, RSK plans to expand to statewide, disability-specific, and ethnic community-based organizations. For example, they have begun working with the Refugee Asylee Mentorship Program (RAMP). In this program, RSK family support specialists provide guidance and resources to the families in their preferred language. ADE/ESS will coordinate with the RSK family support specialist to explain the parent engagement survey. The RSK family specialist aims to translate the survey and to ensure its completion.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Because response rates were found to be representative with respect to race/ethnicity and age of the child, the potential for nonresponse bias in the response data related to those subgroups was minimal. However, ADE/ESS conducted an analysis of the parent survey results across two key subgroups to further assess for any possible nonresponse bias.

The method used to analyze the data for any possible nonresponse was through the Nonresponse Bias Analysis Application (NRBA App). One of the calculations in the app uses weighting as a statistical technique, which can be useful for detecting nonresponse bias. The analysis showed that there was very little difference in the percent agreement for Indicator 8 across the different race/ethnicity groups as well as age bands, and the distribution of race/ethnicity and age bands among respondents was very similar to the population distribution. The results indicated no apparent bias skewed toward nonrespondents, because the weighted results were less than 1% different compared to the unweighted results, thus confirming the accuracy of our overall indicator data.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

171

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	503	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

- The following calculation method is used:
 - Risk Ratio method
 - Alternate Risk Ratio method: used for any PEA that does not meet the minimum cell size or minimum n-size. The alternate risk ratio compares the risk of a specific outcome for a specific group within the PEA with the state ratios for that specific group.
- The threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified: 3.0 and above
- The number of years of data used in the calculation: 3 years
- The minimum cell and/or n-size:
 - Minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30
 - Minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

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

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

Arizona requires all PEAs to maintain special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§ 300.11, 300.201, and 300.301 before Part B IDEA Entitlement Grant funds can be approved by ADE/ESS. ESS/Program Support & Monitoring (PSM) reviews PEA policies and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the six-year programmatic monitoring cycle. If the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

Arizona requires all PEAs to maintain special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§ 300.11, 300.201, and 300.301 before Part B IDEA Entitlement Grant funds can be approved by ADE/ESS. ESS/Program Support & Monitoring (PSM) reviews PEA policies and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the six-year programmatic monitoring cycle. If the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance. Upon completion of the reviews, Arizona determined whether the impacted PEAs complied with IDEA requirements that pertain to the PEA's child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices. None of the identified PEAs had policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

303

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
16	0	371	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

- The following calculation method is used:
 - Risk Ratio method
 - Alternate Risk Ratio method: used for any PEA that does not meet the minimum cell size or minimum n-size. The alternate risk ratio compares the risk of a specific outcome for a specific group within the PEA with the state ratios for that specific group.
- The threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified: 3.0 and above
- The number of years of data used in the calculation: 3 years
- The minimum cell and/or n-size:
 - Minimum n (risk denominator) size = 30
 - Minimum cell (risk numerator) size = 10

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

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

Arizona requires all PEAs to maintain special education policies and procedures in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§ 300.11, 300.201, and 300.301 before Part B IDEA Entitlement Grant funds can be approved by ADE/ESS. ESS/Program Support & Monitoring (PSM) reviews PEA policies and procedures in year 1 and year 4 of the six-year programmatic monitoring cycle. If the PEA makes any changes to the policies and procedures, the PEA must resubmit them to the State for review and acceptance.

Upon completion of the reviews, Arizona determined whether the impacted PEAs complied with IDEA requirements that pertain to the PEA's child find, evaluation, and eligibility practices. None of the identified PEAs had policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	96.17%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.29%	97.69%	97.64%	96.17%	97.18%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
795	760	97.18%	100%	95.60%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

Analyzing the reasons for not completing the evaluation on time, slippage would be attributed to lack of availability of student, lack of availability of required personnel (including parents), as well as a lack of understanding on how to document the state-allowed extension properly. Lack of personnel and the availability of families/students could be attributed to the lingering impacts of COVID-19. Additionally, Arizona uses a cohort model for programmatic monitoring, which results in the collection of monitoring data. Each year's cohort is a rotating collection of PEAs, and this rotation lends itself to fluctuations in the implementation of the requirements by PEA teams.

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

35

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 2022 Noncompliance

Range of days beyond the timeline: 1–225
 Mean: 39.81
 Median: 18
 Mode: 3, 9, and 25: each with 2 occurrences

Reasons for the delays included :

- Unavailability of student* (absences, illness, etc.) (7)
- Miscalculation of 60-day timeline (1)
- Lack of understanding of the evaluation process (2)
- Shortage of evaluators (2)
- Interruption in school calendar (5)
- Lack of tracking system (2)
- Unavailability of required personnel (parent, general education teacher, etc.) (9)
- State allowable extension agreement not confirmed in writing by parent (7)

The reason for the longest delay (225 days) was the unavailability of the student.

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

Per Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) R7-2-401(E)(5), the 60-day evaluation period may be extended for an additional 30 days, provided that the extension is in the best interest of the child and if the parent and PEA agree in writing to such an extension. The SEA considers a written agreement of extension to be compliant with the required timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted. All cases that fall within these parameters would be considered to be completed on time.

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

State monitoring

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

The data for Indicator 11 is collected from the Arizona Monitoring System. The PEAs were selected based on cycle year as a result of a score on the risk analysis tool and by using data from a review of the agency's data, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution results, audit findings, and annual determinations. PEAs selected for monitoring may complete a self-review of files for Indicator 11 in conjunction with verification by the SEA, or the student files may be reviewed collaboratively with the PEA and SEA staff. During the file review, the reviewer (PEA verified by SEA or SEA and PEA together) will ensure that the 60-day initial evaluation timeline has been met by reviewing the date of the parental consent to collect additional data and the date of the eligibility determination. The review will ensure that these dates are within 60 calendar days of each other or 90 days if there is a written agreement to an extension, in accordance with A.A.C. R7-2-401(E)(5).

Data Collection

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

The data that Arizona collected and reported for this Indicator includes a representative sample of children for whom initial evaluations were current at the time of the review, during the 2022–2023 school year monitoring activities.

Valid and Reliable Data

ADE/ESS ensures 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 Support and Monitoring (PSM) specialists who monitor to ensure inter-rater reliability on compliance calls based on

regulatory requirements. The ADE/ESS staff conducts training for PEA staff who will participate in monitoring. The ESS/PSM specialists validate and verify the data through on-site visits or desk audits.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	8	4	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Arizona’s report of correction of findings of noncompliance conforms with the SEA corrective action process, which is administered at the PEA level rather than at the individual student level. In the monitoring year 2021–2022, 12 PEAs had noncompliance that accounted for 23 individual student instances of noncompliance. The ESS/PSM specialists reviewed the child-specific files from the PEAs that participated in programmatic monitoring to determine that the PEAs completed the evaluation for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely unless the child was no longer within the PEA and documented through the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) closeout process within one year of identification of noncompliance. The ESS/PSM specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits and verified that the PEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) related to the evaluation process in conformity with 34 CFR § 300.301 (c)(1) and consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). In cases where correction was not completed within one year, enforcement was enacted, which consisted of a hold of federal IDEA finds, until the correction of the noncompliance was evidenced in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

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

- ESS/PSM specialists conducted follow-up visits and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify the 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. The specialists also ensured that the files were documented and verified through the CAP closeout process.
- ESS/PSM specialists reviewed data from subsequent files and/or conducted interviews with the special education administrators during follow-up visits and/or desk audits to determine if all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child-specific, were corrected and to ensure the ongoing sustainability of the implementation of the regulatory requirements regarding initial evaluations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	3	3	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Arizona verified correction in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system in which identified noncompliance or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements is determined through a review of data collected during programmatic monitoring activities. The system required the correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction to be evidenced using subsequent PEA files. ESS/PSM specialists reviewed all individual instances of student-level noncompliance with every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during programmatic monitoring. Systemic correction was evidenced through ESS specialist reviews of subsequent student files (newly completed evaluations) presented by the PEA. These files were reviewed to ensure that the initial evaluation timeline was met. Subsequent files reviewed evidenced 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

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

Regarding FFY 2020 correction, for any PEA that did not exceed its one-year CAP timeline, the PEA could have completed subsequent evaluations during the 2021–2022 and 2022–2023 school years. All individual instances of noncompliance have evidenced correction through a review of corrected student files by the SEA. All systemic correction, including those after one year, have evidenced correction through a review of subsequent files where 100% compliance was observed. Entities that exceeded the one-year timeline have had enforcement applied, which may have included the interruption of IDEA federal funds. The Arizona State Board for Charter Schools also works with charter schools in Arizona to apply enforcement to support compliant systems.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State has met the required actions.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	97.29%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.78%	99.27%	96.36%	97.29%	99.63%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,111
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	337

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,617
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.	107
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	25
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,617	2,642	99.63%	100%	99.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

25

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

Reasons for Delay

Child did not pass vision or hearing test: 2

Late referral from Part C: 12

Interruption of school schedule: 2

Shortage of school personnel: 9

Total = 25

In FFY 2022, a total of 25 children did not transition on time due to four primary reasons: first, the largest area of delay was due to a late referral from Part C (12). The second most common reason was a due to a shortage of school personnel (9). In addition, there were instances of a child not passing their vision or hearing test (2) as well as an interruption of the school schedule (2).

Range of days Beyond the Third Birthday

Range of Days: 1 to 185 days

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 12 is reported annually by all PEAs in Arizona that have children who transition from Part C to Part B. Data is included for the entire reporting year, from July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023.

Data Collection

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

Valid and Reliable Data

The ADE/ESS Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) and Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) unit specialists ensure 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 ADE/ESS Data Management unit regarding the operation of the data system and interpretation of the questions that are components of the measurement. The State requires an assurance from PEAs through the submission of a signed form attesting to the validity of the data. Random verification checks require that a selected district submit a copy of the front page of the IEP that shows the date of the IEP and the child's birthday for children that transitioned from early intervention service or a prior written notice (PWN) of children found ineligible by the child's third birthday.

Definition of Finding

A finding of noncompliance for Indicator 12 is based on the PEA's self-reported submission in the Web-based data collection system. When a PEA self-reports noncompliance, the SEA verifies the correction of all self-reported noncompliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

All noncompliance from FFY 2021 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists, in conjunction with ADE/ESS Early Childhood Special Education specialists, through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

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

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

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

All noncompliance from FFY 2021 for this Indicator has been verified in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance are reviewed by the ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring specialists, in conjunction with ADE/ESS Early Childhood Special Education specialists, through student file review from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring to ensure that correction of specific regulatory requirements has been made. Systemic correction is evidenced through subsequent file review. Subsequent files reviewed evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state performed the required action.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	61.94%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	83.96%	81.97%	78.03%	61.94%	65.17%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
295	440	65.17%	100%	67.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

Data Source

The data for Indicator 13 is compiled from the Arizona programmatic monitoring system. The SEA selects PEAs for programmatic monitoring on a cycle basis, differentiating the activities based on a risk analysis tool, including data from the SPP/APR, dispute resolution, audit findings, and annual determination. Both the reported number of youths with IEPs, aged 16 and above, and the number of youths aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition reflect the number of files reviewed by the Arizona programmatic monitoring system. PEAs selected for monitoring may complete a self-review of files for Indicator 13 in conjunction with verification by the SEA, or the student files may be reviewed collaboratively with the PEA and SEA staff together. During the file review, the reviewer (PEA verified by SEA or SEA and PEA together) will ensure that all eight secondary transition components are included.

Each year contains a different cohort of PEAs, and some PEAs only serve elementary grades. Thus secondary transition would not be part of a sample. This selection criterion, cohort model, provides a varied sample makeup and size of PEAs in each cohort.

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

- Measurable postsecondary goals
- Postsecondary goals updated annually
- Postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments
- Transition services
- Course(s) 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 is collected from the selected PEAs through the State’s differentiated programmatic monitoring system based on their cycle year data, use of a risk assessment tool, and other factors described above.

The data that Arizona collected and reported for this Indicator includes a representative sample of children aged 16 and older at the time of review and who had a current IEP at the time of the review during the 2022–2023 school year monitoring activities.

Valid and Reliable Data

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
40	28	12	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) specialists reviewed the child-specific files from the programmatic monitoring to determine that the PEAs included the eight components of the secondary transition requirements for the student’s IEPs unless the child no longer attended the PEA, nor was under the jurisdiction of the PEA where findings were associated, and documented through the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) closeout process within one year of identification of noncompliance. ESS/PSM specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits, specifically reviewing the transition requirements in these files for compliance to ensure that the PEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) related to secondary transition, in conformity with 34 CFR §§ 300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

In the monitoring year 2021–2022, 40 PEAs had findings of noncompliance, accounting for 171 individual instances. Arizona verifies correction in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02 (2008). Specifically, ADE/ESS administers a programmatic monitoring system where identified noncompliance, or incorrect implementation of specific regulatory requirements determined through a review of data collected during programmatic monitoring activities, requires correction of individual instances of noncompliance and systemic correction evidenced through a review of updated data collected in subsequent PEA files. All individual instances of noncompliance (student level) are reviewed in student-specific files by ADE/ESS PSM specialists through student file reviews from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring. Systemic correction is evidenced through ESS/PSM specialist reviews of subsequent student files (newly completed IEPs) presented by the PEA. These files are reviewed to ensure that secondary transition requirements are met. Subsequent files reviewed must evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction. Provided the PEA did not exceed its one-year CAP timeline, these subsequent files would have been completed by the PEA during the 2022–2023 school year.

Systemic noncompliance in all 40 PEAs, including those that exceeded one year after notification of findings, evidenced correction through a review of

subsequent files completed by the PEA in which 100% compliance was observed by the PSM specialist through an examination of those files. All individual instances of noncompliance evidenced correction through a PSM review of corrected student files.

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

Arizona used specific methods 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:

- ESS/PSM specialists conducted follow-up, on-site visits, and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify the 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 student's IEPs unless they were no longer under the jurisdiction of the PEA within 60 calendar days from the date of written notification of noncompliance. The specialist also ensured the files were documented and verified through the CAP closeout process.
- ESS/PSM specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits and/or desk audits to determine whether all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child-specific, were corrected and to ensure the ongoing sustainability of the implementation of the regulatory requirements related to secondary transition in conformity with 34 CFR §§ 300.302(b) and 300. 321(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	7	7	0
FFY 2019	3	3	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Arizona used specific methods 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:

- ESS/PSM specialists conducted follow-up, on-site visits, and/or desk audits after the monitoring to verify the 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 student's IEPs unless they were no longer under the jurisdiction of the PEA within 60 calendar days from the date of written notification of noncompliance. The specialist also ensured that the files were documented and verified through the CAP closeout process.
- ESS/PSM specialists reviewed updated data from subsequent files during follow-up visits and/or desk audits to determine whether all instances of noncompliance, including those that were child-specific, were corrected and to ensure the ongoing sustainability of the implementation of the regulatory requirements related to secondary transition in conformity with 34 CFR §§ 300.302(b) and 300. 321(b).

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

All individual instances of noncompliance (student level) are reviewed in student-specific files by ADE/ESS PSM specialists through student file reviews from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring. Systemic correction is evidenced through ESS/PSM specialist reviews of subsequent student files (newly completed IEPs) presented by the PEA. These files are reviewed to ensure that secondary transition requirements are met. Subsequent files reviewed must evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Systemic noncompliance in all PEAs evidenced correction through a review of subsequent files completed by the PEA in which 100% compliance was observed by the PSM specialist through an examination of those files. All individual instances of noncompliance evidenced correction through a PSM review of corrected student files.

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

All individual instances of noncompliance (student level) are reviewed in student-specific files by ADE/ESS PSM specialists through student file reviews from every PEA in which noncompliance was identified during the course of programmatic monitoring. Systemic correction is evidenced through ESS/PSM specialist reviews of subsequent student files (newly completed IEPs) presented by the PEA. These files are reviewed to ensure that secondary transition requirements are met. Subsequent files reviewed must evidence 100% compliance to ensure sustainability and systemic correction.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining seven uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, and remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2019: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The state performed the required action.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	32.60%	34.10%	24.30%	18.59%	19.69%
A	18.59%	Data	21.51%	23.80%	21.91%	18.59%	19.44%
B	2020	Target >=	68.20%	70.20%	56.50%	56.22%	56.72%
B	56.22%	Data	61.17%	54.56%	55.35%	56.22%	59.07%
C	2020	Target >=	79.30%	80.60%	75.00%	71.80%	72.40%
C	71.80%	Data	75.27%	73.72%	72.51%	71.80%	73.88%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	20.79%	21.89%	22.99%	24.09%
Target B >=	57.22%	57.72%	58.22%	58.72%
Target C >=	73.00%	73.60%	74.20%	74.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included

the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	9,861
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,390
Response Rate	74.94%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,379
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,807
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)	666
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).	546

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,379	7,390	19.44%	20.79%	18.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,186	7,390	59.07%	57.22%	56.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	5,398	7,390	73.88%	73.00%	73.04%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>Compared to FFY 2021, Arizona saw a decrease of .78% in the percentage of students enrolling in higher education as well as a 1.65% decrease in the percentage of students pursuing competitive employment. Both of these contributed to a 2.43% decrease in 14B. There may be a number of contributing factors to explain this decline. Looking back to FFY 2021, 14B had an atypical increase from 56.72% to 59.07%. This increase was likely due to the ease of finding a job due to the demand for essential workers during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, anecdotal information suggests that students who exited school were more likely to enter the work force to help to support their families during the pandemic. These types of entry-level jobs may have been less available as the job market became more competitive post-pandemic.</p> <p>One year later in FFY 2022, we saw a reversion to the mean, as our percentage went back to slightly above the FFY 2020 data. According to the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2022 undergraduate enrollment fell 5% over the previous year. However, that same year, there was an increase of over 10% in vocational training in trades such as construction, culinary, and automotive repair. These national statistics coincide with Arizona's data, which showed a slight decrease in higher education but an increase of 1.73% in other postsecondary education. Another potential factor may be due to the rising cost of tuition in postsecondary school within the state</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	of Arizona. The increase in the number of students participating in other postsecondary education options contributed to the overall engagement rate of 14C, which fell less than 1% over last year. This result shows that students remained engaged at a similar rate, though there were slight shifts within the categories of engagement.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	77.03%	74.94%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The State uses +/- 3% as the metric to determine representativeness. The +/- 3% is the discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group. According to the NTACTION Response Calculator, differences between the respondent group and the target leaver group of +/- 3% are important. Negative differences indicate underrepresentation of the group, and positive differences indicate overrepresentation.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

ADE/ESS used the Response Calculator developed by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to calculate the representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of (a) disability type, (b) race/ethnicity, (c) gender, and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout). Detailed results are provided below for race/ethnicity and exit status variables. This calculation determined whether the youths who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youths with an IEP who exited school during the 2021–2022 school year.

The total number of youths who were eligible was adjusted to reflect those who had returned to school, were deceased, or whose data was uploaded by the PEA to the system in error. The FFY 2022 survey response rate was 7,390 of the 9,861 youths eligible to take the survey, or 74.94% of leavers. This rate is lower than the previous year (FFY 2021 response rate was 77.03%).

FFY 2022 PSO Survey Responses by exit status are listed in the table below.

Exit Status	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
Dropped Out	17.71%	24.97%	-7.25
Graduated	82.11%	74.86%	+7.25
Reached Maximum Age	0.18%	0.17%	+0.004

FFY 2021 PSO Survey Responses by exit status are listed in the table below.

Exit Status	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
Dropped Out	16.93%	23.46%	-6.53
Graduated	82.91%	76.35%	+6.56
Reached Maximum Age	0.16%	0.19%	-0.03

In FFY 2021, there was an underrepresentation of responders who dropped out (difference of 6.53 percentage points). This gap increased when compared to the responders who dropped out in FFY 2022 (difference of 7.25 percentage points). Also, in FFY 2021, there was an overrepresentation of responders who graduated (difference of 6.56 percentage points). This gap increased when compared to the responders who graduated in FFY 2022 (difference of 7.25 percentage points).

FFY 2022 PSO Survey Responses by race and ethnicity are listed in the table below.

Race/Ethnicity	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.59%	5.31%	+0.27
Asian	1.00%	0.92%	+0.08
Black or African American	6.32%	6.74%	-0.42
Hispanic/Latino	46.66%	46.13%	+0.53
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.15%	0.16%	-0.01
Two or More	5.43%	5.94%	-0.52
White	34.86%	34.78%	+0.07

FFY 2021 PSO Survey Responses by race and ethnicity are listed in the table below.

Race/Ethnicity	Percent Responded	Population	Difference
----------------	-------------------	------------	------------

American Indian or Alaska Native	6.60%	6.52%	+0.08
Asian	1.07%	0.99%	+0.08
Black or African American	6.41%	7.07%	-0.66
Hispanic/Latino	45.31%	44.37%	-0.94
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.18%	0.18%	-0.00
Two or More	4.12%	4.52%	-0.46
White	36.31%	36.35%	-0.04

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Respondents were representative of 2021–2022 target leavers based on gender, race/ethnicity, and category of disability; however, they were not representative of 2021–2022 target leavers based on their exit status. Students who graduated were overrepresented by 7.25 percentage points and youths who dropped out of school were underrepresented by 7.25 percentage points compared to the target leaver group. ADE/ESS will continue its efforts to increase response rates, especially among youths who drop out. PEAs are expected to utilize effective practices to successfully collect survey responses for all eligible former students. ADE/ESS identifies effective practices through PEA outreach, the provision of professional learning opportunities, and collaborative activities, such as statewide Focus Group meetings.

ADE/ESS plans to continue disseminating strategies confirmed as effective practices for PEAs to increase response rate and representativeness, such as the early identification and reconnection with a former student who dropped out. A targeted outreach initiative is established at the end of each data collection season and utilized to identify PEAs that may benefit from enhanced technical assistance and support. PEAs utilizing this strategy have increased response rates for eligible former students who dropped out. Increasing the response rate of students who drop out will, in turn, address the overrepresentation of the response rate from youths who graduated. ADE/ESS will also continue to communicate with PEAs who successfully contact youths who dropped out to create a list of practices and strategies to share statewide during training opportunities. ADE/ESS also encourages targeted PEAs to connect regionally and across the state to identify new or enhanced strategies for reaching youths who dropped out.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

ADE/ESS will continue to support PEA staff who administer the PSO survey through the use of statewide and targeted technical assistance and professional development opportunities that share best practice strategies to increase the response rate. ADE/ESS will continue to work directly with PEAs to implement school- and community-specific strategies that encourage survey responses from youths across demographic categories, emphasizing strategies to enhance rates for underrepresented populations. ADE/ESS will also continue to provide current materials and guidance resources that support the use of strategies that increase annual response rates. As with prior years, ADE/ESS will host Focus Group meetings to gather insight into field experiences related to Indicator 14 data collection. Focus group members consist of special education administrators and school staff who support PSO efforts.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The method used to analyze the data for any possible nonresponse was through the Nonresponse Bias Analysis Application (NRBA App). One of the calculations in the app uses weighting as a statistical technique, which can be useful for detecting nonresponse bias. Among graduates, 82% responded to the survey, compared to 53% of dropouts. The percentage of graduates who reported being engaged was 77%, compared to 55% of dropouts who reported being engaged.

Based on the analysis from the NRBA App, had the percentage of students who responded been perfectly proportional to the population in terms of exit reason, the Engaged percentage would be estimated to have been 71.4% (versus 73.0%). These differences are relatively small but statistically significant, indicating nonresponse bias. To reduce this identified bias, ADE/ESS will continue to assist PEAs with specific approaches to increase responses from students who have dropped out.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data Source and Collection Methods:

During FFY 2022, 303 PEAs had leavers who met the criteria (youths with a current IEP who aged out, graduated, or dropped out) for participation in the PSO Survey. Of this number, 189 PEAs (62.4%) that were required to participate in PSO data collection had ten or fewer leavers, while 27 PEAs (8.9%) had 100 or more leavers. A total of 9,861 former students statewide were eligible to take the PSO Survey during the FFY 2021 data collection period. Of the 303 PEAs required to participate in the PSO Survey, 283 (93.4%) completed data collection requirements. In addition, 163 PEAs (53.8%) had a response rate of 80% or more from their targeted leavers. A detailed breakdown of the FFY 2022 statewide PSO results, including response rate/representativeness, is available on the ADE/ESS website: <https://www.azed.gov/specialeducation/transition/post-school-outcomes/>, under the heading titled "Results from the Survey."

For PEAs to communicate with former students about the PSO survey, teachers or administrators from the PEA gather contact information on student leavers so they can reach these leavers the following 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 ADE Connect, a single sign-on identity management system. The application auto-populates student demographic information and exit reason imported from the Arizona Educational Data Standards (AzEDS), a web-based system for reporting student-level details to the ADE. PEAs designate school personnel to contact former

students, designated family members (e.g., parents, grandparents, guardians), or state agency representatives to conduct the survey protocol and input responses into the online PSO data collection system. Individuals who responded to the PSO survey were contacted between June 1 and November 10, 2023, after former students were out of school for at least one year.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The State completed the required action.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	8
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	4

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	57.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	68.00% - 78.00%	68.00% - 78.00%	68.00%-78.00%	68.00%-78.00%	68.00%-78.00%
Data	50.00%	75.00%	42.86%	25.00%	33.33%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	68.00%	78.00%	68.00%	78.00%	68.00%	78.00%	68.00%	78.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4	8	33.33%	68.00%	78.00%	50.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	46
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	27

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona's advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state's unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state's Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	82.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	74.00% - 84.00%	74.00% - 84.00%	74.00%-84.00%	74.00%-84.00%	74.00%-84.00%
Data	77.08%	81.82%	72.55%	82.14%	81.48%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	74.00%	84.00%	74.00%	84.00%	74.00%	84.00%	74.00%	84.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7	27	46	81.48%	74.00%	84.00%	73.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In FFY 2022, the number of mediations held was 46, an increase from 27 in FFY 2021. A possible cause for the increase may be attributed to mediation language that was added to the state complaint form on September 20, 2022. On the form, complainants were given the option to request mediation information, provide consent to participate in mediation, or both. 27.8% of state complaints submitted after September 20 consented to participate in mediation, increasing the total number of mediations held.

Although the total number of mediation sessions held increased in FFY 2022, it should be noted that there are more instances where the parties are attempting to resolve issues at the local level. For ADE/ESS, the overall number is low enough that one or two unsuccessful mediations can impact target goals. In FFY 2022, the target was missed by .08%. ADE/ESS believes that the decrease in the percentage of mediations that resulted in a written agreement from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 is due to a normal variation from year to year and is reflected in dispute resolution data nationwide.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

By FFY 2025, targeted Public Education Agencies (PEAs) will increase the performance of SSIP students with disabilities in grade 3 on the English Language Arts (ELA) state assessment from 9.58% to 12.23%.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

A cohort of PEAs that meets the state criteria for participation in SSIP is followed for three years and included in the SiMR data.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

Through Arizona's monitoring system and Risk Analysis Tool, PEAs are provided differentiated support. PEAs that demonstrate a need for systemic and literacy support, as well as the capacity to complete SSIP activities with fidelity, enter an SSIP cohort. Because this part of the identification process was not explicitly stated in prior iterations, the language was added to the first component of the SSIP Theory of Action. Language was added to the second component of the SSIP Theory of Action to include the EBP Walkthrough Process as a named activity that supports SSIP PEAs with the development of evidence-based practices. The element of improving implementation fidelity was added to the third component as a necessary element to provide for activity and student outcomes. The final component of the SSIP Theory of Action was revised to include more specific language in alignment with the SSIP SiMR.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2024/01/SSIP%20Logic%20Model%20and%20Theory%20of%20Action.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	9.58%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	10.64%	11.17%	11.70%	12.23%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of grade 3 students with disabilities within SSIP cohort PEAs, receiving a score of Proficient	The number of grade 3 students with disabilities within SSIP cohort PEAs,	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage

or Highly Proficient, on the ELA component of the state assessment.	receiving a score of Minimally proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, or Highly Proficient, on the ELA component of the state assessment.					
70	968	10.99%	10.64%	7.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The primary reason that the SiMR shows slippage is that Cohort 5 and Cohort 6 have reported an average proficiency well below prior cohorts at the point of SSIP identification and entrance. Because SSIP PEAs are identified by having below-average literacy proficiency on the most recent AASA assessment, that group will always have a proficiency average that is below that of the larger group. However, it is the extent to which the proficiency average of the identified group is below that of the larger group that makes this issue the primary cause. While Cohorts 2–4 were identified for SSIP participation with student group averages of between 8.5%-9.1% proficiency, Cohort 5 had a proficiency average of 7.7% and Cohort 6 had a proficiency average of 4.7%. For the SiMR, the identification averages of Cohorts 3–5 in the FFY 2021 calculation were 8.9%, 9.1%, and 7.7%, respectively. The identification average of Cohorts 4–6 in the FFY 2022 calculation were 9.1%, 7.7%, and 4.7%, respectively. Especially with Cohort 6 being a Year 1 SSIP PEA in the FFY 2022 calculation, descending proficiency averages at the point of identification had a significant impact on slippage.

A compounding factor for slippage was that not only did Cohorts 5–6 begin SSIP with lower proficiency averages than prior years, Cohorts 4–5 showed a regression in their proficiency averages between FFY 2021–2022. This regression is especially significant when looking at both the grade levels of students in relation to COVID-19 and identification/progression through the SSIP process.

Important data for context with the SiMR data is how students outside of Special Education (SpEd) performed with literacy proficiency for the same SSIP cohorts that are in the SiMR data. Non-SpEd students regressed in literacy proficiency by 6.8% between FFY 2021–2022 in SSIP cohorts on the AASA assessment. While this regression shows a more significant decrease by the non-SpEd group as compared to the SpEd group and a gap decrease between the two groups, it highlights the effect that COVID-19 had on the students in those SSIP PEAs and cohorts.

Looking at how grade-level movement affected the SiMR, FFY 2022 data is comprised of Grade 3 students that were in kindergarten when COVID-19 caused school shutdowns for Quarter 4 of the 2019–2020 School Year (SY). At a critical stage of literacy development, these students then experienced Grade 1 in SY 2020–2021 with variations of extended shutdowns and online and hybrid instruction throughout the entire school year.

There were other notable factors that affected slippage, concerning the extended shutdowns and online instruction that schools experienced in response to COVID-19 during SY 2020–2021. One notable factor was that during this time, the SEA SSIP Team was only able to provide Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development (PD) remotely. Cohort 4 was in SSIP Year 1 during SY 2020–2021, and Cohort 5 began SSIP Year 1 the following year. This school dynamic not only highlights the effect that COVID-19 had on the ability for PEAs to maintain systems and student outcomes but also the ability for the SEA SSIP Team to support PEA SSIP Teams for those cohorts at those times.

The SEA SSIP Team found other notable slippage factors in collaboration with Exceptional Student Services (ESS) leadership within the composition of SSIP PEAs. The first notable factor concerned the disproportionality of rural SSIP PEAs in relation to COVID-19 and the ability to provide Internet and SpEd services during SY 2020–2021. The SEA SSIP Team first analyzed locale by collecting data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which provides PEAs with their entity IDs and locale compositions. After disaggregating the group of SSIP PEAs from the group of Arizona PEAs, SSIP PEAs were found to have a significantly higher average of Town/Rural designation, by almost 17%.

In connection, the SEA SSIP Team also noted SSIP cohorts having a significant proportion of PEAs with a tribal designation. Because rural and tribal PEAs had additional challenges providing Internet and SpEd services during periods that relied upon online instruction and because SSIP PEAs are disproportionately rural and have a significant proportion of tribal designations, this would have a significant effect on slippage.

The SEA SSIP Team found another notable factor after analyzing district and charter designations of SSIP and non-SSIP PEAs. While just over 33% of non-SSIP PEAs are designated as districts, 60% of SSIP PEAs are designated as districts. Because districts have a larger incidence of high needs students with disabilities, because SSIP PEAs are disproportionately composed of districts, and due to the challenges of providing SpEd services during SY 2020–2021, this dynamic would be a notable factor toward slippage.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

State ELA assessment data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grade 3, specific to the SSIP cohort, from Arizona’s data systems.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

From a list of all Grade 3 SWD who have a score on the state ELA assessment in the data systems, the data of students who are associated with a District of Residence Identification (DOR ID) corresponding with PEAs participating in years 1–3 of SSIP, is disaggregated and compiled. Within the compiled list of students, the number of students testing as proficient is added to the students testing as highly proficient, and the resulting number is divided into the total number of SWD receiving any score on the ELA state assessment to calculate the proficiency for SSIP.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In connection with Move On When Reading (MOWR) state legislation, every PEA in the state of Arizona is required to submit state testing data for an approved set of literacy screeners, at Fall, Winter, and Spring submission periods. In alignment with MOWR, SSIP collects this data, disaggregated for students with disabilities, from each SSIP PEA at the same submission points as MOWR.

Literacy screener data was examined with the same calculation as the SiMR data to provide context but broken down into the three proficiency levels. By looking at the At-Risk, Approaching Benchmark, and Benchmark groups for students with disabilities in Spring of Grade 3, the context will show both progress in literacy development and progress toward the SiMR.

In Spring of SY 2021–2022, 18.60% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 3–5 scored within the Benchmark level of proficiency. In Spring of SY 2022–2023, 16.90% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 4–6 scored within the Benchmark level of proficiency. This data would indicate a decrease in the Benchmark level of proficiency by 1.7%.

In Spring of SY 2021–2022, 68.44% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 3–5 scored within the At-Risk level of proficiency. In Spring of SY 2022–2023, 67.52% of Grade 3 students in SSIP Cohorts 4–6 scored within the At-Risk level of proficiency. This data would indicate a decrease in the At-Risk level of proficiency by 0.92%.

Because there was a decrease in the At-Risk level of literacy screener state testing for Grade 3 students in SSIP between SY 2021–2022 and SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP also examined the At-Risk proficiency levels for students in grades 1–2 for these same cohorts and school years to look for a trend at the formative levels of literacy development. Grade 2 reported a decrease of 0.64% in the At-Risk level of proficiency for these cohorts and school years, while Grade 1 reported a decrease of 1.64% for these cohorts and school years.

With Grades 1–3 literacy screener state testing showing slighter decreases at the Benchmark levels of proficiency, in addition to decreases at the At-Risk proficiency levels, this data may indicate a comparatively positive effect at the formative levels of literacy development.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Looking more closely at the student groups and when they are included in the data, FFY 2021 data is comprised of students that were completing Grade 1 when COVID-19 shut schools down for Quarter 4 of SY 2019–2020. FFY 2022 data is comprised of students that were completing Kindergarten when COVID-19 shut schools down for Quarter 4 of SY 2019–2020. Cohort 4 was identified for participation in SSIP during COVID-19 school shutdowns and SSIP Year 1 coincided with instruction that was predominately either hybrid or online. This dynamic also meant that activity fidelity was lower for Cohort 4 as the SEA SSIP Team was unable to provide the same level of support for SSIP activities and systemic support, in-person SSIP Setup and Activity Training Meetings prior to Year 1, or site-based Professional Development for the EBP Walkthrough Activity in Year 2.

When Cohort 5 was identified for participation in SSIP at the end of the hybrid/online instructional year, because the state did not have assessment data from when they would normally be identified due to COVID-19 shutdowns, assessment data from the same year that was used to identify Cohort 4 was used to identify Cohort 5. By the time they began SSIP, they were identified with data from more than two years prior. To begin SSIP Year 1, after Cohort 5 reported incoming levels of systemic implementation on the Success Gaps Rubric activity, 12 of the 15 system indicators would have the lowest average levels of any Cohort 3–6.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2024/01/SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Added elements to the Evaluation Questions column for the Literacy Section row include: Does literacy data on AASA state testing provide support for the maintenance or revision of SSIP process and activities, compared to the General Education (GenEd) group? Does literacy data on AASA state testing provide support for the maintenance or revision of SSIP process and activities, in context with literacy screener data? Does literacy screener data provide support for the maintenance or revision of SSIP process and activities, in context with AASA comprehension data?

Also, "Literacy Initiatives Work Group (LIWG) Members" was replaced with "Data Systems (DaSY) Collaborative Group Members" in each row of the Partnerships column.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

Although the GenEd group had been reviewed each year and referencing the gap between the GenEd and SpEd groups for achievement and growth context, the text had not been populated on the Evaluation Plan. Although the achievement and growth context between literacy screener and AASA data had been reviewed since the Fall of SY 2021–2022 when statewide GenEd and SSIP SpEd data became available, the text had not been populated on the Evaluation Plan. Populating this text on the Evaluation Plan became even more important when deeper analysis became necessary from the apparent SiMR data disparity.

LIWG was temporarily removed from the SSIP evaluation plan because group meetings have been paused while Move On When Reading (MOWR) and Exceptional Student Services (ESS) go through internal restructuring. DaSy was put in its place. This collaborative group began meeting in SY 2023–2024 and is helping to support the development of data systems in ESS while looking at early literacy associated with preschool.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Support Documents and Technical Assistance (TA) Meetings:

Although the Success Gaps Rubric and Action Plan (SGR & AP) activity already included directions with embedded links to short guidance videos and examples, the SEA SSIP Team provided additional support in response to prior stakeholder feedback. In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team created activity guidance documents that included screenshot examples and embedded these links alongside the short guidance videos. While reading the activity directions, PEA SSIP Teams can now choose how they receive additional support.

For additional guidance, Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) offered two site-based and one virtual TA meeting that provided programmatic monitoring activity guidance to participants. As part of this training, Year 1 SSIP PEAs were offered a TA presentation of the SSIP Year 1 activities and requirements. The presentation included tips for navigating the process with fidelity, examples of activity completion, and time for questions and answers.

Streamlining Data Systems:

The SEA SSIP Team has reformatted all data sheets to allow for collaborative analysis of longitudinal data, which means that when new activity and student outcome data is available, the SSIP Coordinator can efficiently incorporate the new data into the existing data set and devote more available capacity to analysis and systemic improvement.

SSIP activity data is collected with fillable Microsoft Word documents that are formatted for continuous data. PEA SSIP Teams in Years 1–3 can record updated data on the same activity form during each submission period. After each submission, the SEA SSIP Team transfers the data to a spreadsheet for analysis. Through the end of SY 2022–2023, when the SEA SSIP Team wanted to use a more efficient means of analysis, such as using pivot tables and slicers, the team reformatted the spreadsheet data for compatibility.

Because the data for each submission period was kept on individual sheets, the SEA SSIP Team had to copy/paste between sheets for longitudinal analysis. The process of reformatting and comparing different sheets at each submission consumed time and allowed margin for process error. Before SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team reformatted and consolidated activity submission data into a single data sheet for the past four years in a format that is directly compatible to pivot tables and slicers. The new format allows for the integration of new data into the compatible and ongoing format, and long-term data can be analyzed and displayed immediately after new data integration with a lower consumption of time and higher data quality.

For student outcomes data, literacy screener data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) is collected with ongoing MS Word forms three times each year and is transferred to data spreadsheets. Data spreadsheets are also generated from query, for both statewide literacy data that is reported for the all-student group in the Move On When Reading (MOWR) ADE Connect data portal and for AASA state testing data. After collecting the SWD literacy screener data into a single spreadsheet, the SEA SSIP Team aligned the format of that spreadsheet to the format of the collated MOWR spreadsheet data and then integrated the data into a single spreadsheet that aligns with future MOWR data queries. The AASA state testing data was also collated and aligned to the efficient integration of future queries.

Funding Initiatives Through the SSIP Contract:

For each PEA that signs their SSIP Contract annually, the SEA/SSIP offers \$5,000.00 to support their systemic improvement initiatives that are aligned with IDEA funding guidelines. In the prior system, PEA SSIP Teams would complete the SGR & AP activity, review contract eligibility, and align SSIP Action Plan initiatives with planned expenditures at different times.

The SEA SSIP Team collaborated with ESS Projects to streamline the documentation and process. The product of the collaboration was a one-page document where PEA SSIP Teams align SSIP Action Plan initiatives with allowable expenses. This document has cut down on the paperwork needed by the PEA SSIP Teams to receive the SSIP funds as well as for reimbursement.

In SY 2022–2023, the timeline allowed the SEA SSIP Team to work with Cohort 6 PEA SSIP Teams on this streamlined, one-page, document after the completion of the SGR & AP. Afterward, the SEA SSIP Team embedded a PEA SSIP Team's streamlined, one-page, document within their SGR & AP. Embedding the document within the SGR & AP allows the PEA SSIP Team to manage the alignment of planned expenditures more easily with Action Plan initiatives, as initiatives evolve during the three years in SSIP. The intended outcome of further streamlining the document and process was to improve the initial and continued participation of SSIP contract funding as well as to account for turnover in staff associated with the contract and SGR & AP.

For Cohort 7 in SY 2023–2024, the timeline allowed the SEA SSIP Team to embed the streamlined, one-page, document within the initial submission of the SGR & AP. Now, PEA SSIP Teams can assess their SGR systems, plan their AP initiatives, review their expenses/contract, and align SSIP Action Plan initiatives with allowable expenses, in sequence and during the same time together. After activity submission, the SEA SSIP Team was able to review and provide feedback for both the SGR & AP and planned expenditures. For process support, the SEA SSIP Team embedded links to SSIP Contract support documents into the SGR & AP activity and provided guidance at PSM-SSIP TA Meetings before their initial submission. This further streamlining was intended to provide more support, avoid issues due to PEA staffing turnover, expedite funding, and further improve initial and continued SSIP Contract participation.

Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

At the end of SY 2021–2022, four presentations were posted to the SSIP website to review activity and student outcomes for the year. The presentations included one that reviewed SGR & AP activity outcomes, one that reviewed EBP Walkthrough activity outcomes, one that reviewed stakeholder feedback including results from the SSIP and EBP Surveys, and one that reviewed student outcomes from both literacy screener and AASA state testing data. The SEA SSIP Team then provided each PEA SSIP Team that had completed Year 2 with additional slides to put their team's EBP Walkthrough data within the context of SSIP Cohort 4. The SEA SSIP Team also provided each PEA SSIP Team that had completed Year 3 with additional slides to put their team's SGR & AP data within the context of SSIP Cohort 3.

While this system of providing outcome feedback provided high potential value, there was not available evidence that the potential value translated into kinetic value and to substantiate the capacity use.

At the end of SY 2022–2023, the SEA SSIP Team was able to streamline the above process by creating an electronic poster that included an outcome summary indicator for the SGR & AP activity, the EBP Walkthrough activity, and for student outcomes. The outcome poster was quick and easy to review. It included a link to an outcome presentation on the SSIP website that PEA teams could choose to follow if they wanted expanded information. The outcome presentation included a link to a survey that PEA teams could choose to follow if they wanted to request a data display for their outcomes within the context of their cohort. This streamlined change allowed the SEA SSIP team to conserve capacity and implement other continuous improvement strategies.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

SSIP Process Guidance Documents and Training Meetings:

The SEA SSIP Team provided additional guidance documents and training opportunities for PEAs to continuously improve support systems through the enhancement of Technical Assistance (TA). The SEA SSIP Team measured the effectiveness of support in the short term through how documents and trainings were utilized and the resulting indicators of activity fidelity.

For an example of continuous improvement to support PEAs with TA, Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) provided the option for PEAs entering the monitoring year to attend one of several TA meetings to preview the monitoring process. These TA meetings included an SSIP presentation that previewed the structure and process for SSIP activities and support opportunities prior to SSIP Year 1. While PEA attendance was optional, 12 of the 15 PEAs beginning SSIP Year 1 chose to attend. Then, when asked about TA-support in the SSIP Survey, 80.6% of respondents characterized TA support presentations as either "mostly" or "very" helpful.

However, when PEA SSIP Teams were asked which resources and support documents they found helpful for TA, SGR & AP Support Documents and Videos went down 3.6% from the prior year. For context, other TA support documents also showed a moderate decrease in data for helpfulness, and in contrast, PEA SSIP Team reported finding correspondence and meetings with the SEA SSIP Team to be more helpful this year, than last year. This shift in data may simply be attributed to the enhancements in the TA provided in a more site-based and personalized format as well as the front-loaded TA specifically offered for PEAs participating in Year 1 of SSIP. The SEA SSIP Team also used the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG) to analyze whether improved guidance and TA may have resulted in improved activity fidelity. The FFG provides PEA SSIP Teams with activity feedback and TA after each of the six SGR & AP submissions during the three-year SSIP process. The FFG provides data for fidelity indicators, such as the extent to which PEA SSIP Teams show examination of the 45 evidence-based practices that support the 15 learning community systems. In submission 1 of Year 1, without having the benefit of a TA meeting and SSIP presentation prior to the first submission, SSIP Cohort 6 had an average FFG score of 92.3%. In

submission 1 for SSIP Cohort 7, after most had attended the meeting that provided TA on SSIP activities such as the SGR & AP, the average FFG score was 94.9%.

These continuous improvement efforts not only serve the connection between TA and activity fidelity but should also be evidenced through the data as the SEA SSIP Team monitors activity and student outcomes.

Organizing Data for Analysis and System Alignment:

The process of collating and aligning activity and student outcome data has had positive effects on capacity, collaboration, and the consideration of variables on outcomes.

Concerning capacity, the time that had been previously devoted to reformatting at each submission and collection period is now devoted to integrating new data variables for analysis and display. For example, after integrating the Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates from the National Center for Education Statistics, the dashboard that displays PEA locations on a map of Arizona aided in the coordination of site-based professional development for the EBP Walkthrough activity and PEA SSIP Teams. It was also helpful in the analysis of whether and to what extent rurality influenced student state testing outcomes.

Concerning collaboration, the SEA SSIP Team can more effectively target opportunities to support PEA SSIP Teams because the dashboard allows users to display levels of system implementation in conjunction with ongoing initiatives. For example, after each submission, the SEA SSIP Team reviews SSIP Action Plans for initiatives that align with available PD or resources for evidence-based practices and then notifies the PEA SSIP Team of the opportunity and/or resource. In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team used the AP Initiatives dashboard by targeting specific system indicators to display PEA SSIP Teams action steps. Providing an effective system for aligning PEA SSIP Team needs with support opportunities allows for the capacity to spend more time with PEA SSIP Teams and supporting the Team's needs. Shifting this capacity is important, as the data shows that PEA SSIP Team's value the PEA-specific and in-person support more, in recent feedback collected.

Funding Initiatives Through the SSIP Contract:

Under the prior SSIP Contract structure, the SEA was retaining just under 50% of PEA participation from SSIP Year 1 to Year 3. Where the SEA SSIP Team began coordinating with PEA SSIP Teams directly with the streamlined form, Cohort 6 had both a higher initial participation in Year 1, and over 80% of the PEAs that signed the SSIP Contract in Year 1 have also signed the SSIP Contract in Year 2. Where the SEA SSIP Team embedded the streamlined form into the initial SGR & AP activity for Cohort 7, PEA SSIP Teams were able to align initiatives and submit planned expenditures about two months prior to when Cohort 6 had been able to in the previous year.

However, due to internal capacity strain at the SEA, the process of getting SSIP Contracts to SSIP PEAs was delayed in SY 2023–2024. As in prior years, SSIP PEAs will receive and can sign their SSIP Contract regardless of an approved plan, so it is the expectation that more SSIP PEAs will pursue an approved streamlined narrative when contracts are delivered. A high degree of initial and sustained SSIP Contract participation will support the sustainability of their systems and have the potential to provide for positive activity and student outcomes.

Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

The decision of allowing PEA SSIP Teams to request PEA-specific outcome presentations, rather than to create and distribute all of them prior to request, allowed the SEA SSIP Team to devote capacity to other SSIP collaborative and improvement efforts without having to sacrifice the availability or value of stakeholder feedback.

While the intention was to provide the first tier of information as a time-efficient summary of outcomes that would allow PEA SSIP Teams to choose their tier of depth and time commitment thereafter, due to the timing of distribution and a website issue, the SEA SSIP Team provided the second tier of the outcome presentation directly to PEA SSIP Teams for their review.

Although they were still offered the opportunity to request the PEA-specific displays in the third tier of outcome data, only one of the Cohorts 4 and 5 PEAs that received the second tier of information completed the survey intended for the third tier of information. While general data was collected in the SSIP Survey, such as 80.6% characterizing SSIP support presentations as "Mostly Helpful" to "Very Helpful," specific data pertaining to the use and value of the outcome presentations was not collected. This is especially notable because Cohort 4 had exited SSIP prior to the outcome presentation availability and because Cohort 5 comprised 1/3 of the cohorts receiving the SSIP Survey after presentation availability.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Updating Internal Procedures for Activity Submission and Technical Assistance (TA):

PSM leadership reviews policies and procedures during collaboration involving continuous improvement. Prior to SY 2023–2024, procedures to several policies were refined to alleviate SEA capacity strain and to improve activity fidelity. The new language for procedural updates was embedded into activity directions, procedural reference documents, and activity feedback documents. These updates were provided to both SEA and PEA SSIP Teams during SSIP process support meetings.

For example, after the initial completion of the SGR & AP activity document, the procedure has been for PEA SSIP Teams to submit activity updates at each of the next five submissions, using the same activity document. This activity process allows for cohesive and continuous data, and it alleviates the PEA SSIP Team capacity strain of having to complete a full documentation at each activity submission. Prior to SY 2023–2024, when the PEA SSIP Team submitted the SGR & AP activity on a completely new activity form, the procedure was for the SEA SSIP Team to integrate the new information onto their previous and ongoing form and then to work with the PEA SSIP Team to clarify any new information that might conflict with prior information. This procedure was an inefficient use of time for both the SEA and PEA SSIP Teams. In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team leadership provided TA to both PEA and SEA SSIP Team members, documenting activity updates on the same activity form as a submission requirement.

As an indication of alleviating capacity strain, both SEA and PEA SSIP Team groups had positive feedback for the procedure changes. Most survey responses referred to an appreciation for procedural language that is easy to reference, follow, and cite. As an early indication of improved fidelity and referring to the example, there have been no instances where PEA SSIP Teams that have submitted updates on new activity forms in SY 2023–2024. General fidelity improvements will be detailed in subsequent FFY 2022 sections.

EBP Activity Support with Examples and Non-Examples:

The resources for the EBP Classroom Walkthrough Process offer three tiers of activity support. The first tier is the EBP Walkthrough Tool itself, providing evidence-based classroom practices in both sentence list and checkbox form. During the EBP Walkthrough Activity Presentation, the SSIP Coordinator guides PEA SSIP Teams through the practices on the EBP Tool to check for understanding and the opportunity to proceed to the second and third tiers of support for a more common understanding of a practice or group of practices amongst group members. While the second tier of support appears from within the EBP Presentation through context explanations and graphics, it is the third tier of support that was identified for additional

improvement.

The third tier provides specific examples and non-examples of how EBPs may be seen in the classroom. As this document has evolved from a Grades 3–5 to a K–3 resource, examples and non-examples have evolved to become a better representation for K–3 classrooms. During the first PD for activity support in SY 2023–2024, the PEA SSIP Team noted a few instances where examples and non-examples would apply more directly to Grades 2–3 classrooms and less directly to K–1 classrooms. This stakeholder feedback was noted as helpful and a rich discussion about possibilities for providing additional grade level examples ensued.

Although the SEA SSIP Team did not immediately revise the resource to include the additional grade-level examples, notations were made throughout the SSIP Coordinator's copy so the SSIP Coordinator could provide additional examples in subsequent discussions. PEA SSIP Teams involved in subsequent discussions, reported that they appreciated being made aware of this connection and in knowing that the resource would continue evolving to improve PD support.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

SSIP Process Guidance Documents and Training Meetings:

The SEA SSIP Team will continue to monitor survey data from participants to drive the revision and creation of trainings and documents for the continuous improvement of PEA support. The next step regarding TA support meetings, will be to promote this support opportunity with better intentionality for newly identified PEAs at Monitoring Setup Meetings that occur in the Spring prior to SSIP Year 1. At these meetings, monitoring specialists and SEA SSIP Team members visit PEAs at the end of their Year 3 monitoring cycle year to explain their Risk Analysis tool and Year 4 monitoring structure that may include SSIP activities for the following three years. In the Spring of SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team will provide the dates, structure, and implementation fidelity data connected to attending the TA support meetings to newly identified SSIP PEAs during Setup Meetings. The intended outcome of providing this information to newly identified SSIP PEAs in the Spring is improved participation at TA support meetings before SSIP Year 1 begins. Subsequently, the anticipated outcomes of improved participation at the TA support meetings would be further improvement of activity fidelity and activity outcomes.

Organizing Data for Analysis and System Alignment:

The next step for the data and systems alignment is to complete dashboards for available data and to expand collaboration with other agency stakeholders. The SEA SSIP Team will not only create the dashboards for student outcomes with AASA and literacy screener state testing but will also incorporate variable subgroups, such as Least Restrictive Environment, Race/Ethnicity, and Disability by Category, to see how they may factor into those outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that, by May 2024, the dashboard will be ready to share with ESS leadership. The dashboard will be used toward the consideration of PEA support system alignment and for collaboration with internal stakeholders, such as Move On When Reading (MOWR) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The intended outcome of the data alignment and collaboration will be to align systems of support with PEA needs and to provide improved technical assistance and professional development.

Funding Initiatives Through the SSIP Contract:

The next step for supporting SSIP Contract funding is to gather updated participation data and stakeholder feedback for the current system that supports SSIP Contract participation. Although initially positive, the SEA SSIP Team will have to consider the ongoing participation data and feedback in conjunction with the capacity constraints that affected timelines for the delivery of SSIP Contracts in SY 2023–2024. The intended outcome of continuing to monitor the data and stakeholder feedback is that the SEA SSIP Team will continue to improve the support and participation of the SSIP Contract, resulting in more support for PEA initiatives, systems development, and student outcomes.

Activity and Student Outcome Presentations:

The next step in disseminating activity and student outcome data is for the SEA SSIP Team to include specific examples where there is an explicit connection between EBP and system development along with student outcomes. At the end of SY 2023–2024, Cohort 5 will be the first SSIP cohort to have three years of SGR & AP, AASA, and literacy screener data as well as having had onsite support available for the EBP Classroom Walkthrough activity in Year 2. Despite Cohort 5 showing a regression in literacy outcomes after SSIP Year 2 as a group, the SEA SSIP Team will look for exemplars within Cohort 5 after SSIP Year 3 to highlight the positive connection between activity fidelity, positive activity outcomes, systemic development, and positive student outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team will then use any available exemplars, as well as any exemplars in future cohorts, as evidence to showcase the effectiveness of SSIP activities during SSIP presentations to stakeholders, including to other SSIP PEAs. The SEA SSIP Team will look for exemplars when 2024 AASA data is available during SY 2024–2025, and any exemplars will be integrated into stakeholder presentations at the end of that school year. The intended outcome of showcasing SSIP exemplars and the value of SSIP activities to SSIP PEAs, is to drive active participation early, sustain it throughout the process, and raise the probability that positive practices and outcomes will continue after participation in an SSIP Cohort. The intended outcome of using exemplars to promote the effectiveness of support systems to internal stakeholders is to leverage the alignment of supports for SSIP and ESS.

Updating Procedures for Activity Submission and Technical Assistance:

The next steps for reviewing policies and procedures are to continue collecting data from feedback for the recent procedural changes, monitor activity fidelity, and monitor capacity at the SEA level for the alignment of procedures. The intended outcome of aligning procedures with the data is to provide for optimal activity outcomes.

EBP Activity Support with Examples and Non-Examples:

The next step for the EBP Examples and Non-Examples document is to provide a new iteration of the document where each of the 28 classroom practice indicators has both a Grades K–1 and Grades 2–3 set of examples and then to make this document available to Cohort 7 PEA SSIP Teams prior to EBP Walkthroughs in SSIP Year 2. The SEA SSIP Team will also notify Cohort 6 PEA SSIP Teams of the updated document so Teams that choose to continue EBP Walkthroughs beyond SSIP Year 2 submission requirements are apprised of the updated resource. The intended outcome of updating the EBP Walkthrough Examples and Non-Examples document is to increase the common understanding of the practices amongst PEA SSIP Team members, resulting in greater inter-rater reliability, activity data quality, and the scale-up of support resources.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The SGR & AP—EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2023/07/SSIP%20Success%20Gaps%20Rubric%20and%20Action%20Plan.doc>

The SGR & AP is a tool that was originally provided by the IDEA Data Center. The tool has been adapted by the SEA SSIP Team to include a deliberate consideration of EBPs in the SGR. By providing EBP prompts that align with system-level descriptions before analyzing levels of system implementation, PEA SSIP Teams can calibrate levels of system implementation and target EBPs within AP initiatives with high fidelity. SEA SSIP Teams use these prompts to gauge fidelity and to provide direct and explicit feedback. The tool includes five groups for system indicators, 15 system indicators, and a total of 45 EBPs that support the system indicators.

--Indicator Group 1: Data-Based Decision-Making (DBDM)

- Decisions about curriculum, instructional programs, academic/behavioral supports, and school improvement are based on data.
- The PEA's screener and benchmark assessment have research to support effectiveness.
- Programs and initiatives use subgroup data.
- SpEd and GenEd teachers engage in regular collaboration with academic and behavioral data to create and monitor student goals and for planning instruction.

--Indicator Group 2: Cultural Responsiveness (CR)

- Culturally responsive instructional interventions and teaching strategies are used throughout the school or district.
- Trainings and PD develop cultural responsiveness in academic planning and instruction.
- School events include celebrations of community diversity.
- Staff are culturally responsive and effective regarding linguistic diversity.
- Student linguistic needs and supports are accounted for, in a variety of ways.
- Family language supports are offered at meetings and events.
- Home correspondence is accessible to families.
- Learning community event data is collected and analyzed for subgroup attendance and family engagement.
- Parent and family event data is used for continuous improvement and shared at stakeholder meetings.
- Stakeholders use data to improve family engagement, especially in connection to students who experience success gaps.
- The learning community celebrates diversity with intentional consideration of subgroups.

--Indicator Group 3: Core Instructional Program (CIP)

- A consistent, well-articulated curriculum is in place and is implemented with fidelity, evidence-based practices, and differentiation.
- There are a variety of trainings and support documents available, involving horizontal curriculum alignment.
- There are a variety of trainings and support documents available, involving vertical curriculum alignment.
- Administration accounts for teachers delivering curriculum with fidelity.
- There is ongoing PD to support instructional EBPs.
- Administration accounts for the implementation of EBPs from PD.
- Flexible grouping is evident in lesson plans and seen through observations.
- Instructional technology is being used for engagement, depth of knowledge, and to provide accommodations.
- Accommodations and modifications are evident in instruction, assignments, and assessments.
- Choices based on learning styles and interests are being used to leverage learning.
- SpEd teachers regularly consult with GenEd teachers, English Learning (EL) leads, and Special Area (SA) teachers to plan for meeting the needs of unique student populations.
- Every family has the opportunity to learn about their student's core instructional program.
- Every family is informed about the ways that instruction is differentiated for their child.

--Indicator Group 4: Assessment—Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (Assessment)

- Universal screening is used to identify needs for early intervention or targeted supports.
- The PEA uses a reading screener to identify needs for intervention and targeted supports.
- The PEA uses a math screener to identify needs for intervention and targeted supports.
- The PEA uses a behavior screener to identify needs for intervention and targeted supports.
- Teachers use formative assessments to monitor skill development, make instructional adjustments, and plan/implement tier 2–3 interventions.
- Teachers use progress monitoring tools to monitor skill development, make instructional adjustments, and plan/implement tier 2–3 interventions.
- The PEA informs families about academic and behavior screener results.
- The PEA regularly informs families about progress monitoring results.

--Indicator Group 5: Interventions and Supports (I&S)

- Evidence-based behavioral interventions and supports are multi-tiered and implemented with fidelity.
- In connection with structuring interventions, every teacher has been trained to used screeners, benchmarks, diagnostics, and curricular and behavioral assessments.
- GenEd teacher provide tier 2–3 interventions in the classroom multiple times each week, based on assessments.
- There is a structure for providing push-in and/or pull-out services for interventions.
- Push-in/pull-out services are provided multiple times each week, based on assessments.
- Every teacher has been trained in the use of EBP resources for planning and implementing interventions.
- Teachers have support for planning intervention and using progress monitoring data toward implementing EBP interventions.
- Intervention considerations include data, students with disabilities, English learners, continuous improvement, and grade-level planning.
- Teachers receive PD on how past experiences and culture affect bias and behavior.
- Interventions are implemented with fidelity.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

<https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2023/08/SSIP%20EBP%20Walkthrough%20Tool.doc>

PEA SSIP Teams use the EBP Walkthrough Tool, a collection of 104 evidence-based classroom practices divided into four quadrants, to record observed practices in grades K–3 classrooms. The data can then be used to not only celebrate instances where instructors exhibited an EBP but also to provide opportunities to further improve practices through such activities as peer observation and targeted professional development.

--Quadrant 1: Inclusive Learning Environment

- Classrooms exhibit an inclusive learning environment that is student-centered and engaging.
- EBPs pertain to student learning outcomes, classroom management and organization, and the availability of student resources.

--Quadrant 2: Instructional Practices

- Classroom instruction is evidence-based, engaging, and responsive.
- EBPs pertain to direct and systematic instruction, the use of assessments, and teacher responsiveness.

--Quadrant 3: Student Interactions

---Student interactions are collaborative and support learning objectives.

----EBPs pertain to modes of student learning, collaboration, and expression.

--Quadrant 4: Student Engagement

---Students are engaged in meaningful activities that support learning objectives.

----EBPs pertain to student motivation, application of learning, and classroom differentiation.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The SGR & AP—EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

Indicator Group 1 of the SGR focuses on systems for data-based decision-making. The evidence-based practices include making decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives, based on data. It also includes the use of screener and benchmark assessments, making decisions with subgroups in mind, and evidence of use from the administrative to classroom levels for the benefit of student outcomes.

Indicator Group 2 of the SGR focuses on systems for cultural responsiveness. The evidence-based practices include celebrating diversity with professional development during gatherings as well as supporting linguistic accessibility diversity with families in all correspondence and interactions.

Indicator Group 3 of the SGR focuses on systems for implementing a well-articulated curriculum. The evidence-based practices include ensuring both horizontal and vertical alignment, flexible grouping, instructional technology, differentiated instruction with accommodations and modifications, providing for student learning styles and interests, instructional collaboration, professional development of curriculum and practices, implementation with fidelity, and informing families about the core curriculum and how it is differentiated for their student.

Indicator Group 4 of the SGR focuses on systems for incorporating tools for Assessment. The evidence-based practices include using universal screeners and progress monitoring tools for both academics and behavior, using benchmark assessments, and informing families about results.

Indicator Group 5 of the SGR focuses on systems for interventions and support. The evidence-based practices include a proactive and restorative, district-level discipline policy implemented responsively and with fidelity. It includes employing a multi-tiered system of supports for both academics and behaviors, guidance by screeners and diagnostic tools, and interventions that are continually monitored for progress by teachers who are trained to use resources and to operate with cultural sensitivity and fidelity within this system of supports. It also includes continually informing families about how their student fits within this system of supports.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

Quadrant 1 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based classroom practices involving an inclusive learning environment. These include the display of measurable learning outcomes, classroom expectations, and word/sound walls that students can use to make progress toward learning goals, a classroom library that provides choices and reading accessibility, the use of manipulatives for connections to abstract concepts and relevance, and effective transitions between activities.

Quadrant 2 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based instructional classroom practices. Quadrant 2 includes “I Do” practices involving frontloading, adequate response wait times, and explicit-systematic explanations that incorporate a variety of learning modalities and fosters engagement. Quadrant 2 includes “We Do” practices that involve scaffolding, providing immediate and specific feedback, informal formative assessment that is responsive prior to independent practice, and a variety of problem-solving methods. Quadrant 2 includes “You Do” practices for responsive independent practice that include coaching, monitoring, and time for mastery. It also provides lesson closure that reviews learning targets and learning assessment.

Quadrant 3 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based practices pertaining to student interaction in the classroom. This includes students engaging in various collaborative learning expressions, text activities, goal setting and planning, and higher-order learning modalities. It also has the ability for students to make choices and present learning in various ways.

Quadrant 4 of the EBP Tool focuses on evidence-based practices pertaining to student engagement in the classroom. These practices include students involved in activities with real-world relevance that are targeted to the zone of proximal development, are considerate of strength and needs, involve self-regulation, and allow for a high degree of student-lead communication. Quadrant 4 also includes differentiated activities with accommodations and modifications to content and process.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The SGR & AP—EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

Focusing on data-based decision-making allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. This is not only done with data for general education but also for subgroups such as English language learners and special education students. It is only by the juxtaposition of both the aggregated and disaggregated data that administrators and teachers can make the most appropriate decisions, from curriculum to intervention and from the masses to the individual. Comprehensively and specifically using data to inform decisions is foundational for improving outcomes, thereby impacting the SiMR in a positive direction. This should also impact the district/program policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all decisions are made with data in mind and based on the data itself.

Focusing on cultural responsiveness allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. This supports the SiMR because an individual's outcomes are a product of their learning, learning is a product of experiences, and culture is a critical component of a student's experiences. It is essential to respect the cultural similarities and differences of all members of the learning community. Cultural diversity within and amongst people is a crucial component of how they have learned and will continue to learn. Respecting this diversity allows students and stakeholders to feel appreciated, to buy into the learning community, and to be motivated to learn within it. It can also be used as a filter to understand perspective, which is the window to understanding what an individual needs to learn and develop. Beyond the inherent nature of language's importance in accessing learning, culture is also important. As it is essential to understand the learning needs of a student with disabilities, it is imperative to understand that individual's perspective and

learning components, including how culture has guided and continues to guide the process of learning.

Focusing on implementing a well-articulated curriculum allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. When the learning community develops a curriculum that accounts for the variety of learning components and equips the curriculum with tools that meet the variety of ways in which students learn, teachers can flexibly use that comprehensive framework to deliver that instruction with evidence-based practices to meet the needs of learners in general and as individuals. The tools for differentiating the curriculum are essential for students with disabilities, to provide access to the curriculum. Supporting the core curriculum, the delivery of that curriculum with evidence-based classroom practices, and teachers differentiating the curriculum to meet student needs is essential for supporting student outcomes and the SiMR.

Focusing on the incorporation of universal screening and progress monitoring allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning communities appropriately. By screening at several points through the year, members of the learning community have reliable data for growth and the development of foundational learning skills. The resulting data can then be used for comparison to prior learning and other groups/subgroups for the development of learning targets and toward the categorization and initial application of learning groups. Then, after diagnostic and refinement where needed, the learning plan and progress can be monitored to make adjustments that provide for developmental precision and the highest potential for positive outcomes and the SiMR. This includes screening and monitoring for behavioral development as a factor for learning access and their outcomes.

Focusing on interventions and supports allows PEAs to meet the needs of their learning community appropriately. After reliable data is used to determine a student's needs, it is vitally important for the progression of learning to meet the more specific and involved needs with a structure and learning plan to meet those needs. While this may mean that a zone for optimal learning can be found within a small group structure, it may also mean that the zone for optimal learning can only be met through an individualized learning structure and plan. Meeting student needs includes having interventions and supports for behavioral development as a factor for learning access, student outcomes, and the support of the SiMR.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

Focusing on having an inclusive classroom learning environment allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms appropriately. Much like respecting cultural diversity, an inclusive learning environment provides students the ability to feel appreciated, buy into the learning community, and be motivated to learn within it. It can also provide a support structure that offers learning accessibility and paves the way for improved outcomes to support the SiMR.

Focusing on instructional classroom practices allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classroom appropriately. At the center of pedagogy, effective instructional practices include an intimate knowledge of subject matter, learning tools, and of students, from the individual members of the group to the dynamics of the group itself. Further, effective instructional practices involve a nuanced plan to meet these needs and a skillful implementation of scaffolding that also requires constant monitoring of feedback and adjustment throughout the process toward skill independence. Particular attention must be paid to this arena of practices because of how multi-faceted, interconnected, and critical these practices are for positive student outcomes and to support the SiMR.

Focusing on student interactions allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms appropriately. When students experience a variety of ways to interact with the learning process, content, materials, and with others, they can make cognitive connections and experience development to a greater degree. They also have more opportunities to make choices, take ownership of their learning, experience drive toward positive outcomes, and support the SiMR.

Focusing on student engagement allows teachers to meet the needs of the students in their classroom appropriately. In connection with interactions, engagement also includes the identification of strengths and needs, and the skillful use of differentiation to meet those needs. Targeting these individual facets of learning will provide positive outcomes for individuals and support the SiMR.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The SGR & AP—Monitoring for Fidelity:

As described in the section for infrastructure improvements, PEA SSIP Teams complete the SGR & AP in the fall and spring of each year to assess levels of system implementation in the learning community and implement initiatives for systemic improvement. After each submission, the SEA SSIP Team provides activity feedback on the Fidelity Feedback Guide (FFG). The SEA SSIP Team monitors FFG scores through the three-year SSIP process to see how PEA SSIP Teams used the feedback provided by the SEA and toward improving fidelity. The SEA SSIP Team then compares the Year 3 Fall scores to growth in levels of implementation on the Success Gaps Rubric (SGR) to assess the connection between fidelity and practice change.

In Fall of Year 3, Cohort 3 had an average fidelity score of 70.5%. At that point, the aggregate of Cohorts 3–5 had an average score of 88.2%. This data shows that Cohorts 4–5 had ascended Cohort 3 fidelity earlier in their implementation.

In Fall of Year 3, Cohort 4 had an average fidelity score of 89.0%. At that point, the aggregate of Cohorts 4–6 had an average score of 94.2%. This data confirms both prior and continued fidelity ascension.

In Fall of Year 3, Cohort 5 had an average fidelity score of 94.4%. At that point, the aggregate of Cohorts 5–7 had an average score of 95.5%. This data further confirms both prior and continued fidelity ascension.

While having yet to enter Year 3 of SSIP, Cohort 6 had an average fidelity score of 92.3% in Fall of Year 1 and 97.7% in Fall of Year 2.

The SGR & AP—Connecting Fidelity to Practices, Systems, and Student Outcomes:

The trend of SGR levels of implementation did not have the same consistency as the trend in activity fidelity. As outlined in the SSIP Theory of Action, the SEA SSIP Team reviews growth in SGR levels of implementation for Cohorts that have completed three years in SSIP. At the end of SY 2022–2023, the nine PEAs in SSIP Cohort 4 pursued 41 AP Initiatives across all five indicator groups. Of the initiatives that were documented for more than two consecutive submission periods, there was an average growth of 66% toward one full level of implementation on targeted initiatives. For context, many of the SSIP Cohort 4 PEA SSIP Teams reported stagnation and even regression of systemic levels in Year 1 and going into Year 2, which coincides with the first full school year after COVID-19 shutdowns, and that most were also reporting online/hybrid instruction. This is especially notable because SSIP Cohort 3 had grown an average of 92% toward one full level of implementation on targeted initiatives after three years in SSIP. Therefore, rising fidelity does not appear to be a predominant factor, in comparison to factors related to COVID-19, in providing for improved practices and systemic improvement.

Making the connection between systemic improvement and student outcomes, while SSIP Cohort 4 showed a 2.0% decrease in AASA literacy proficiency between SSIP Years 2–3, SSIP Cohort 3 showed a 1.8% increase between SSIP Year 2 and Year 3, and another 1.7% increase in their first full year after SSIP participation. Therefore, rising fidelity does not appear to be a predominant factor, in comparison to factors related to COVID-19, in providing for improved student outcomes.

While Cohort 5 will complete SSIP Year 3 at the end of SY 2023–2024, and that current average growth is currently above one full level of system implementation during SSIP, they have been the only cohort to report average levels of system implementation below Partially Implemented to begin SSIP Year 1. They also had a regression in AASA literacy proficiency in the current reporting period.

The SSIP Survey—Supporting Fidelity and Outcomes:

In connection to activity fidelity, over 80% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized the TA that the SEA offers for completing SSIP activities as either Mostly Helpful or Very Helpful. This rise in positive response from the previous year can be attributed to the additional training opportunities and support resources that the SEA SSIP Team offered in SY 2023–2024 and can be used to support rising fidelity data. However, when asked to characterize the Success Gaps Rubric and Action Plan activity for analyzing and improving systems in the learning community, 77.8% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized the activity as either Somewhat, Mostly, or Highly effective, with almost half characterizing the activity as being Mostly Effective to Highly Effective. This data is down by about 15% in overall effectiveness reported by PEA SSIP Teams in SY 2022–2023. This data would further support how rising support and fidelity was unable to overcome other predominant factors for activity and student outcomes.

The Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Walkthrough Process—Monitoring for Fidelity:

In SSIP Year 2, PEA SSIP Teams submit two EBP Walkthrough Tools from classroom walkthroughs at each submission period. For data reliability and process fidelity, the SEA SSIP Team monitors that EBP Tools reflect the same two K–3 classrooms at each submission period during literacy instruction. In SY 2022–2023, SSIP Cohort 5 submitted EBP Tools that aligned with these data reliability and process fidelity standards 89.5% of the time by EBP submission 2. In SY 2023–2024, SSIP Cohort 6 submitted EBP Tools that aligned with these data reliability and process fidelity standards 100% of the time by EBP submission 2.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Connecting Fidelity to Activity Outcomes:

PEA SSIP Teams conduct two classroom walkthroughs and submit the EBP Walkthrough Tool data at each of the three submission periods during SSIP Year 2. The SEA SSIP Team records the data from each EBP Tool at each submission into a spreadsheet. Data is recorded by quadrant, so each group of EBP indicators can be analyzed by quadrant and for overall growth.

While SSIP Cohort 4 decreased in the average EBPs per classroom between submission 1 and submission 2 by almost eight practices, the Cohort netted an average of five additional classroom EBPs between submission 1 and submission 3.

While SSIP Cohort 5 also decreased in average EBPs per classroom between submission 1 and submission 2 by about five practices, the Cohort reported an average of seven additional classroom EBPs between submission 1 and submission 3.

In SY 2023–2024, SSIP Cohort 6 has reported an average of 11 additional EBPs per classroom between submission 1 and submission 2. By quadrant, quadrant 3 has an average increase of about two EBPs per classroom, while quadrants 1, 2, and 4 have an average increase of about three EBPs per classroom. These increases show a positive connection between rising fidelity and practice change for Cohort 6.

The EBP Survey—EBP Walkthroughs and Support for Fidelity and Outcomes:

In SY 2023–2024, when asked to characterize the TA provided to support the activity process and outcomes, all 15 PEA SSIP Teams in SSIP Cohort 6 characterized the support as either Mostly or Highly Supportive. When asked to characterize the EBP Classroom Walkthrough activity toward improving classroom practices and student outcomes, all 15 PEA SSIP Teams characterized the activity as having some positive effect, with only one characterizing that effect as being minimal. Both responses for SEA SSIP Team support and activity outcomes show improvement over SY 2022–2023 responses and would further support the connection between rising fidelity and practice change.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The SGR & AP—Monitoring EBP System Progress:

Regarding the EBPs for the Data-Based Decision-Making (DBDM) system indicator, PEAs have reported beginning SSIP with an average level of implementation of about 2.5 and completing SSIP with an average of about 3.4, regardless of being connected to Action Plan initiative. This data would equate to systems that begin half-way toward being fully Implemented and growing almost half-way toward Exemplary implementation. The significant growth of DBDM, despite being directly targeted for initiatives, is a testament to how interwoven the EBPs are within every learning community system and how integral they are for the growth and development of systems.

The EBPs for the Cultural Responsiveness (CR) system indicator had no connected Action Plan initiatives in SY 2020–2021. Rising steadily in each of the past few years, it now accounts for about 16% of all Action Plan initiatives in SY 2023–2024. This data coincides with SSIP Cohorts 5–7 reporting an incoming average for systemic implementation below that of prior cohorts.

The EBPs for the Core Instructional Programs (CIP) system indicator accounted for 56% of all initiatives in SY 2020–2021. In SY 2023–2024, it now accounts for 34.4% of all initiatives. However, looking within the CIP system group, Action Plan initiatives targeting Differentiated Instruction (DI) has risen in proportion to the whole. This data coincides with the overall system implementation data for the system group. While SSIP Cohorts 5–7 entered SSIP with higher average levels of systemic implementation than SSIP Cohorts 3–4 involving a Well-Articulated Curriculum and providing EBP Instructional Practices, SSIP Cohorts 5–7 each entered SSIP with lower systemic levels of implementation for DI. Notably, SSIP Cohort 5 entered SSIP with an average DI that was in the Planning range. EBPs for CIP remain essential to systemic improvement and student outcomes because it remains the system group that is targeted with most of the Action Plan improvement initiatives, especially in relation to DI.

Regarding EBPs in Assessment systems, with the exception of SSIP Cohort 5, every other cohort in Cohorts 3–6 reported beginning SSIP Year 1 with levels of implementation at least halfway between Partially Implemented and fully Implemented. All cohorts beginning with Partially Implemented systems then reported growth to fully Implemented systems by the beginning of SSIP Year 2. Connected to the DBDM group, EBPs for Assessment are integral to paving the pathway for the growth and development of systems.

SSIP Cohorts 5–7 have entered SSIP Year 1 reporting a lower average level of implementation in each Interventions and Supports (I&S) system, compared to SSIP Cohorts 3–4. Of the I&S systems, MTSS Response is the lowest system indicator in the group. Where each of SSIP Cohorts 6–7 have reported entering SSIP Year 1 with system levels just above Partially Implemented, SSIP Cohort 5 reported an average level of implementation in the Planning range. EBPs related to I&S are critical for supporting the foundational skills necessary to access the general curriculum.

The SSIP Survey—Monitoring SpEd-GenEd Collaboration:

In addition to the EBPs that are targeted for growth within each activity, all SSIP activities are designed to strengthen collaboration for leveraging activity and student outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team uses the SSIP Survey to collect data concerning the level of collaboration in SSIP learning communities, and a survey within the Special Education Professionals Check-In group to provide context.

In SY 2023–2024, when PEA SSIP Teams were asked to characterize the frequency of collaboration between SpEd and GenEd, between 72% and 92% of PEA SSIP Teams characterized collaboration when planning instruction, setting student goals, and monitoring student progress as occurring frequently or continuously. This data contrasts with data collected at the Special Education Professionals Check-In group in the Winter of SY 2022–2023, made up of staff from various PEAs across the state of Arizona, where about 61% of respondents characterized these same realms of collaboration as occurring no more than occasionally. Because collaboration between SpEd and GenEd is so important for student development, because there is a need for support, and because SSIP data provides evidence for providing that support, it is a valuable system for EBPs and will continue to be integral to the SSIP.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Monitoring EBP System Progress:

Both SSIP Cohorts 5 and 6 reported an increase in average classroom EBPs regarding an Inclusive Classroom Learning Environment between submission 1 and submission 2, with SSIP Cohort 6 reporting the highest average increase at almost three additional practices.

While SSIP Cohorts 4 and 5 each reported an average decrease of about three classroom EBPs for Instructional Classroom Practices between submission 1 and submission 2, SSIP Cohort 6 showed an increase of over two classroom practices.

While SSIP Cohorts 4 and 5 each reported an average decrease of about one classroom EBP pertaining to Student Interactions between submission 1 and submission 2, SSIP Cohort 6 showed an increase of over two classroom practices.

While SSIP Cohort 4 reported an average decrease of over two classroom EBPs pertaining to Student Engagement between submission 1 and submission 2, and SSIP Cohort 5 reported an average decrease of almost three EBPs, SSIP Cohort 6 showed an increase of over three classroom EBPs.

By disaggregating the data by cohort, by quadrant, and between submission periods, analysis shows that the trend of end-of-year data improving in the prior two years is most likely going to take an even bigger step forward at the end of SY 2023–2024. This data further supports the ongoing use of the EBP Walkthrough activity and the support it provides for classroom EBPs in the learning community.

The EBP Survey—Monitoring EBP Rollout:

Due to the high degree of local control and being housed within the monitoring system, a key factor in expanding rollout for the Arizona SSIP is supporting activities that PEA SSIP Teams and SSIP learning communities find valuable for supporting EBPs in the learning community. For the EBP Walkthrough Process, while the SSIP requires the data from two walkthroughs at three submission points, Program Support and Monitoring (PSM) provides professional development that highlights how PEA SSIP Teams can choose to use the SSIP activity within a structure that provides a high degree of value for improving classroom EBPs, supporting walkthrough systems, and providing for student outcomes.

On the EBP survey in SY 2023–2024, when PEA SSIP Teams were asked if they chose any of the expanded rollout options beyond SSIP submission, 11 of 15 PEAs reported choosing to conduct post-observation meetings with teachers. 7 of 15 PEAs reported choosing to target specific practices for PD and/or coaching and to conduct peer observations between teachers within grade-level teams. Five PEAs reported connecting the walkthrough data to student outcome data, and four PEAs reported expanding the walkthrough rollout to additional classrooms and/or grade levels. In conjunction with survey data characterizing the EBP Walkthrough activity as having a positive effect on classroom practices, data showing that PEAs are expanding activity rollout further supports the value of the activity and support of EBPs in the classroom.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The SGR & AP and EBPs Supporting Learning Community Systems:

EBPs for Data-Based Decision-Making (DBDM)—

Although this data would not indicate a significant need for additional support, PEA Action Plan initiatives are often connected to supporting systems for Interventions & Supports. In connection with stakeholder feedback on the SSIP Survey, while continuing to look for PD opportunities to support PEA SSIP Teams, the SEA SSIP Team will improve resources that model how the collection of literacy screener data can be used in connection to a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). The SEA SSIP Team will make that resource available to support DBDM systems and will make more substantive connections to the collection of Literacy Screener data during SSIP. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that providing the new resource and making a connection between the activities will not only have a positive effect on survey responses and outcome data for the activities but also further positive outcomes for SpEd-GenEd collaboration.

EBPs for Cultural Responsiveness (CR)—

Because PEA SSIP Teams are reporting incoming levels of systemic implementation that are down from prior years, the SEA SSIP Team will also continue to collaborate with agency partners regarding opportunities for CR development. However, due to the scarcity of available PD at the SEA, the SEA SSIP team will look to expand offerings through analysis of former PEA SSIP teams that targeted this initiative and explore how they were able to show gains. By exploring the Action Steps that have led to the rise in systemic implementation, the SEA SSIP Team anticipates it may be able to use this model to implement new systems of support for other PEA SSIP Teams.

EBPs for Core Instructional Programs (CIP) —

Because initiatives targeting Differentiated Instruction (DI) have been rising, the PEA SSIP Team will increase collaboration with the Arizona Professional Learning Series (AzPLS) to develop a system of referral based on capacity and need. After modules to support formative assessment, collaboration, and literacy strategies, the PD offered by ESS Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS) supports DI with instructional design that targets content, process, and product. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that this support will provide positive outcomes for students with disabilities in the GenEd classroom and support the SSIP SiMR.

EBPs for Assessment-Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (Assessment)—

Because levels of systemic implementation for Assessment have grown to fully Implemented by SSIP Year 2, data does not suggest an impending need to strengthen support for the evidence-based practices in this system. However, because quarterly meetings with the Literacy Initiatives Work Group (LIWG) were temporarily paused in SY 2023–2024 due to ESS and MOWR restructuring, the SEA SSIP Team will look for opportunities to reestablish participation in the LIWG and include collaboration with other units at the SEA involving Assessment to maintain a high level of support for Assessment systems and the connection to DBDM. The SEA SSIP Team will also make a connection between systems for DBDM and the additional resource to support Literacy Screener data collection. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that the collaborative and resource connections will result in data showing the continued growth and development Assessment EBPs and systems.

EBPs for Interventions and Supports (I&S)—

As data indicates a growing need to support I&S, the SEA SSIP Team will not only make the connection between I&S and the data collection resource for literacy screeners, in conjunction with Assessment and DBDM, but will also look to strengthen collaboration with stakeholders that offer PD. For

example, after seeing Action Plans that included Multi-Tiered Behavior Supports (MTBS), the SEA SSIP Team has strengthened collaboration with MTBS offered by ESS and attended PD that SSIP PEAs participated in. While there has been a capacity strain within ESS PD units over the past year, current restructuring may allow for expanded I&S PD and supports for PEAs that has been lacking more recently. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates the resource connection and improved capacity to support PEAs with PD and will meet the growing need for support and provide improved data for EBPs and systemic improvement.

The EBP Walkthrough Process—Supporting Classroom Practices and Walkthrough Systems:

In addition to improving the existing resource of the Examples and Non-Examples document, the SEA SSIP Team will implement an additional resource for PEA SSIP Teams that are finding the activity valuable enough to expand rollout. This resource will not only list the ways that rollout could occur but also expand upon each to include ways they can be implemented with evidence-based practices, monitored for progress, and can provide for positive outcomes. Then, during PD, the opportunities for expanded rollout can be referenced with the resource that expands upon each rollout opportunity. One additional next step will be making the connection between the four EBPs for classroom differentiation on the EBP Observation Tool, with AzPLS support and to DI in the SGR & AP. The anticipated outcomes of strengthening the resources and collaboration with AzPLS are EBP Walkthrough activity data and data reflecting expanded rollout, continuing to increase.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

While three-year SGR & AP data for systemic implementation growth was lower for Cohort 4 than Cohort 3, the overall activity outcome data remains positive, and the trendlines for both Cohorts 5–6 suggest improved outcome growth going forward. Since school closures, EBP Walkthrough data outcomes have shown improvement in EBP growth each year, with the Cohort 6 trendline far outpacing prior cohorts. PEA SSIP Teams responding to surveys continue to report receiving improved support by the SEA SSIP Team and improved collaboration between SpEd and GenEd within SSIP PEAs each year. While AASA data has decreased in this reporting period, Literacy Screener data shows more moderate decreases at the benchmark proficiency level of foundational literacy development and positive developments at the At-Risk level of proficiency.

Because the Arizona SSIP has a strong foundation in supporting foundational literacy for positive student outcomes, because that foundation is rooted in the support of evidence-based practices to strengthen learning community systems to leverage student outcomes, and because a significant degree of outcome data continues to be positive in connection with SSIP activities, the SEA SSIP Team will continue to implement the Arizona SSIP without any significant modifications to activities. However, the SEA SSIP Team has begun exploring SSIP data calculations concerning systems change theory and data for initiatives leading to higher levels of system implementation. For example, over the past three years, Action Plan initiatives have taken an average of 2.5 submission periods to result in a higher level of systemic implementation reported on the SGR & AP. This means that while Year 1 SSIP PEAs are included in the yearly calculation, systemic change does not occur for most SSIP PEAs until Year 2. It is also not until Year 2 that SSIP PEAs participate in the EBP Walkthrough activity that targets classroom walkthrough systems and evidence-based classroom practices. Even then, SSIP PEAs are given the choice to conduct walkthroughs in Grade K–3 classrooms to fit PEA needs and align with practice interventions at more developmental levels. A PEA choosing to target Grade 1 classrooms would not have students effected by this activity support until one year after SSIP participation.

Exploring SSIP data calculations could also take external factors into consideration, such as the negative and lasting impact that COVID-19 had on systemic development, especially for the significant number of students from rural and tribal communities that were disproportionately affected and included within SSIP Cohorts. Shifting the SSIP Cohorts included in the calculation may not only align more appropriately to students that have experienced the effect of SSIP participation but also to the time it takes for reading development and systemic improvement to translate into student SIMR outcomes.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

As special education data and other information became available after the close of the 2021–2022 school year, individuals from the ADE/ESS staff reported to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Arizona’s advisory group, during FFY 2022. SEAP was established in accordance with the IDEA. The purpose of SEAP is to provide policy guidance concerning special education and related services for children with disabilities in Arizona. SEAP is composed of a broad range of stakeholders throughout Arizona. Groups represented on the panel include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, teachers, early childhood educators, charter schools, school districts, institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel, secure care facilities, and public agencies. SEAP provides input and feedback during the process of determining targets, and ADE/ESS representatives respond to questions and comments from SEAP members regarding indicator data. This organization also advises ADE/ESS on the state’s unmet needs for students and children with disabilities.

Beyond SEAP, data from each indicator, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), was reported to specific groups. These groups included the Special Education Director Forum and Raising Special Kids (RSK), the state’s Parent Training and Information Center. During these presentations, participants were encouraged to ask questions. They were also given contact information if they wanted to provide personal experiences relating to the indicators or had suggestions for improvement activities.

For SSIP, stakeholders include all people who are invested in the outcomes for students with disabilities in SSIP PEAs. Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, individuals with disabilities, teachers, administrators, parents and family members of students with disabilities, intra-agency partners, interagency partners, officials for homeless assistance, representatives for foster care and juvenile facility placement, and SEA specialists. Stakeholder input includes collaborative efforts toward documenting and implementing activities and providing stakeholder feedback, whether collected formally or informally, through correspondence or verbal discourse. Feedback may be received in the body of an email, during meetings, or through survey results.

In addition to SEAP and RSK, there are a variety of stakeholder groups that contribute feedback for SSIP support and toward outcomes for students with disabilities.

PEA SSIP Teams:

PEA SSIP Teams are typically comprised of 4–6 members of learning community leadership, often including the special education director, principals and assistant principals, instructional specialists and coaches, and teachers in both special and general education. These PEA SSIP Teams are the primary stakeholders involved with the SGR self-assessment, the AP documentation and implementation, and in conducting EBP walkthroughs to collect and develop classroom practices. They meet monthly and quarterly to review initiative goals, available resources to meet those goals, how to mitigate or

circumvent barriers to goal progress, and to use progress monitoring data to fortify or revise plans toward goals.

PEA SSIP Learning Community Members:

As the implementation of initiatives from the SGR and AP activity depends on a variety of stakeholders within PEA learning communities, they are integral SSIP stakeholders. This group includes not only administrators, but also school leadership, instructional coaches and specialists, teachers, support staff, and families. School principals are a primary source of stakeholder feedback for the EBP survey.

Special Education Directors:

Special education directors are the leaders of PEA SSIP Teams, are members of SEAP, are the principal source of stakeholder feedback at the Special Education Check-In meetings, and are the primary respondents of the SSIP Survey. They also provide continuous communication through the progress of SSIP activities as the primary contact for the SEA at PEAs.

The Data Systems (DaSy) Data Processes and Systems Thinking Center:

In cooperation with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Waters Center for Systems Things, the DaSy Center offers the opportunity the Arizona ESS Team to collaborate with group organizers and other state teams. This collaborative platform helps to drive the development and use of data systems for the support of PEAs and positive student outcomes.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Learning Collaboratives:

ESS members continually participate in the NCSI Cross-State Learning Collaboratives (CSLC). The SSIP Coordinator participates in the EBP Collaborative to deepen knowledge and practices for collaborative professional learning across SpEd and GenEd and strengthen systems for positive student outcomes. As part of this collaborative, the SSIP Coordinator participates in a group that focuses on instructional practices. The SSIP Coordinator then return to the ESS group where members share and collaborate toward the support and alignment of systems.

IDEA Data Center (IDC) Data Quality Peer Group:

The IDC Peer Group provides a platform for SSIP Coordinators and data managers to share how data systems support their state SiMRs. Collaborations often include how SiMRs are calculated and reported, what data sources are being used, and how different data variables effect the quality of data.

Move On When Reading (MOWR):

Arizona's MOWR policy is designed to provide students with evidence-based, effective reading instruction in kindergarten through third grade to position them for success as they progress through school, college, and career. MOWR is supported by state legislation that explains the requirements for pupil promotion, early literacy instruction, and accountability for student achievement in reading. Operating within ADE/Academic Standards, the SEA-MOWR Team collects literacy screener data and literacy plans for Arizona students in grades K–3.

ADE/ESS Program Support and Monitoring (PSM):

Specialists in ESS/PSM are the primary contacts between the SEA and PEA, involving initiating, submitting, and progressing through SSIP activities. They are also a source of ongoing stakeholder feedback through all forms of communication and from monthly PSM meetings.

ADE/ESS:

ADE/ESS holds monthly meetings to share information and progress and to collect stakeholder feedback from other perspectives within the SEA. The ESS group includes PSM, Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), Operations, Special Projects, Early Childhood Special Education, and Dispute Resolution. It also collaborates regularly with agency partners such as Assessment, Unique Populations, and K–12 Academic Standards.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

At the PEA level, the SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders through regular correspondence. The SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders in TA and PD before and after SSIP activity completion and through opportunities to support Action Plan initiatives. The SEA SSIP Team also engages stakeholders with the dissemination of data from activity and student outcomes.

At the SEA level, the SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders by expanding relationships that align systems and leverage positive outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team engages stakeholders through collaborative groups that meet regularly and share the common goal of targeting EBPs to support activity and student outcomes and by collecting feedback from PEA SSIP Teams and other stakeholders after activity participation and data dissemination.

PEA SSIP Teams, Special Education Directors, and Learning Community Members:

In SY 2021–2022, the SEA SSIP Team began differentiating PD for the EBP Walkthrough activity in SSIP Year 2, which was an engagement effort to align the needs of each learning community with the appropriate level of activity support. While this process was valuable, the time it took to collect the Walkthrough Systems Survey information, coordinate scheduling, and provide PD before activity submission in October caused capacity strain. After adjustments were made to the implementation timeline in SY 2022–2023, the process was conducted with much less capacity strain. Then, with this streamlined system for differentiated PD in place for SY 2023–2024 when PSM began with staffing shortages, the SSIP Coordinator was able to take the lead on scheduling all 15 PEA SSIP Teams for differentiated support without a prohibitive capacity strain. Actively managing the capacity strain also allowed for a high degree of engagement from stakeholders and increased activity rollout by PEAs.

SEAP:

Annually, the SEA SSIP Team presents activity and student outcomes to SEAP. The SEA SSIP Team receives stakeholder feedback on progress and process implementation through meeting and survey responses. Some examples of past feedback that has been collected and that has led to key SSIP improvements, including the alignment with MOWR and setting six-year targets for progress toward the SiMR.

In SY 2023–2024, the SEA SSIP Team again provided a presentation on current evidence-based practices, activity outcomes, and student outcomes. The SEA SSIP Team reviewed factors related to slippage and the SSIP SiMR calculation and provided time for questions and stakeholder feedback.

Raising Special Kids (RSK):

To improve parent engagement, the SEA has transitioned the RSK SPP/APR sessions from presentation meetings to an interview format on a live streaming platform. During the livestream, the SPP/APR Coordinator will be reviewing all of the indicator pages of the new SPP/APR website. On the Indicator 17 page, the SSIP will highlight the connection between student outcomes and the importance of family engagement in the learning community. While the RSK live stream will allow access for parents to share their perspective and stakeholder feedback during and after the livestream, the Indicator 17 page will also provide the SSIP Coordinator's email address for questions and feedback.

The Data Systems (DaSy) Data Use and Systems Thinking Cohort:

In SY 2023–2024, Arizona Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Professional Learning and Sustainability (PLS), and SSIP are participating in The Data Systems (DaSy) Data Use and Systems Thinking Cohort. The purpose of this collaborative group is to gain a more common understanding of what system thinking is and how it can be applied to SEA systems to support PEAs. The Arizona Team is beginning to transition toward developing a framework of how this might look in ADE/ESS. In the current phase, the Arizona Team is organizing data based on availability and reliability of Pre-K and Kindergarten assessments connected to literacy and trying to make a connection with assessments such as literacy screeners and AASA assessments to form clearer picture of proficiency at the early stages of literacy development. This data organization and analysis is intended to then provide the foundation that highlights needs and elucidate the need for supports through those stages of development.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Learning Collaboratives:

In SY 2023–2024, as a member of the EBP Collaborative, the SSIP Coordinator has attended several Special Interest Groups (SIGs) involving instructional supports for literacy. Through these meetings, several connections have been made to help support systems and further engage stakeholders. For example, the State Director for Arkansas joined the group to talk about using LRE data in relation to student outcomes. The SSIP Coordinator will apply these concepts to the data dashboard display for student outcomes in Arizona, which can then be used to engage stakeholders in the alignment of systems and the support of Arizona PEAs within and outside of SSIP participation.

IDEA Data Center (IDC) Data Quality Peer Group:

In SY 2023–2024, as a member of the IDC Data Quality Peer Group, the SSIP Coordinator has attended several collaborative meetings. There have been several concepts that have been used to support the Arizona SSIP. For example, discussions concerning methods of stakeholder engagement concerning implementation fidelity have been used during the EBP Walkthrough Process PD to support PEA SSIP Teams and data reliability.

SEA SSIP Team Members:

Stakeholder feedback during intra-agency collaboration often involves the consideration of PEA capacity, regularity and form of communication, and improvements involving PEA community needs and concerns. For example, feedback during a Spring PSM Meeting in SY 2022–2023 led to the new documentation and training of procedures concerning activity submission and TA by the SEA SSIP Team to begin SY 2023–2024. This not only provides procedural consistency but also provides for the engagement of stakeholders when making stakeholder feedback actionable and useful.

SEA/ESS Directors and Leadership:

In SY 2023–2024, collaboration with leadership was primarily focused on slippage. SEA/ESS Leadership was supportive toward exploring slippage factors such as student populations being affected by COVID-19 school shutdowns and online/hybrid instruction, cohorts with disproportionately rural locales, and group calculation as related to systemic improvement composition and timing.

Move On When Reading (MOWR):

In the second year of alignment with MOWR in SY 2022–2023, the SEA MOWR Team included the SEA SSIP Team on correspondence regarding MOWR literacy plans for SSIP PEAs. This communication has allowed for opportunities to provide additional support. For example, SEA SSIP Team members have incorporated initiatives documented in MOWR literacy plans into collaborative discussions with PEA SSIP Teams during EBP Walkthrough activity support meetings to highlight initiative and activity alignment.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

PEA SSIP Teams and the SSIP Survey:

There were three concerns noted on the SSIP Survey in SY 2023–2024.

The first concern was in response to a new question on initiative barriers. When PEA SSIP Teams initially document Action Plans, the Teams note potential barriers to implementation. To collect data with more regularity and actual barriers as opposed to potential barriers, the SEA SSIP Team provided a list of potential barriers commonly noted in SSIP Action Plans and then asked the PEA SSIP Teams to characterize the extent to which they became actual barriers to implementing initiatives. Responses showing a high degree of Overwhelmed Teachers and Staff Turnover will be used in collaboration with Recruitment and Retention. Responses showing the Cost or Unavailability of Resources or PD as a significant barrier will be used in collaboration with leadership and toward the current realignment of ESS systems of supports. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to monitor these concerns as they are addressed through collaborative efforts.

The second concern was in response to the availability of the SSIP Contract to support SSIP initiatives with funding. While the timeline to provide SSIP Contracts was delayed in SY 2023–2024, the issue was due to SEA capacity issues that were addressed with realignment and do not project to be an issue in SY 2024–2025. The SEA SSIP Team will monitor this concern by comparing the contract timeline of SY 2023–2024 to SY 2024–2025, and then comparing the feedback for SSIP Contract concerns. This analysis will help determine if the SEA SSIP Team needs to take further steps toward resolving the concern.

The third concern was in response to a question asking SEA SSIP Teams to describe ways in which the SEA SSIP Team can improve the SSIP going forward. The respondent requested guidance on how PEA SSIP Teams can use the Literacy Screening activity data in conjunction with collaboration and intervention. This concern aligns with the support resource planned from data analysis to support Literacy Screener data use, in conjunction with the support of SGR & AP activity outcomes and the EBPs in systems for Data-Based Decision-Making, Assessments, and Interventions. The SEA SSIP Team will continue to seek feedback from stakeholders pertaining SSIP concerns and improvements.

PEA SSIP Teams and EBP Walkthrough Support:

A concern noted by a PEA SSIP Team during EBP Walkthrough activity support was to incorporate different grade levels of examples and non-examples

on a support resource for the EBP Walkthrough Process during PD delivery. This concern was addressed immediately during subsequent PD, and the resource will undergo these revisions for Year 2 PEA SSIP Teams to use for submission 1 in SY 2024–2025.

SEAP and the SSIP SiMR Calculation:

After presenting activity and student outcomes, the SEA SSIP Team reviewed the SiMR and factors associated with slippage. Stakeholders engaged in a discussion that included literacy development, the timing and grade levels involved in EBP Walkthroughs, and the average time for reporting systemic improvement on the SGR & AP. SEAP stakeholders then provided feedback pertaining to the SSIP SiMR calculation. While maintaining the SSIP SiMR for AASA proficiency in Grade 3, options that were discussed for SiMR calculations that included maintaining the current SiMR calculation, for including only cohorts in SSIP Years 2–3 in the calculation, and for including cohorts in SSIP Years 2-3 along with the cohort that is one year beyond SSIP participation. Data reliability was discussed in conjunction with these options. While further feedback and analysis will be taken into consideration before the possibility of changing the SSIP SiMR calculation, SEAP stakeholders provided the feedback to include cohorts in SSIP Years 2–3, along with the cohort that is one year beyond SSIP participation, in the SiMR calculation.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

On the first submission each year, every Arizona PEA submits Literacy Plans to Move On When Reading (MOWR). Literacy Plans include indications for core curriculum, duration and frequency of literacy instruction, assessment tools, and MTSS structures.

To make this information available for analysis supporting and aligning systems, the SEA SSIP Team will create a MOWR-SSIP Systems dashboard. The dashboard will incorporate the information from both MOWR Literacy Plans and the SGR & AP will show an expanded view of PEA systems. This display will be used in collaboration with stakeholders such as ESS-PLS and MOWR to align supports for PEA systems.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The dashboard will be created by May of 2024 and will be shared with PSM Leadership by June of 2024. Stakeholder feedback will be collected, and based on the feedback, the dashboard will be revised before presenting to PLS and MOWR for collaboration and system alignment. The SEA SSIP Team anticipates that the display will be a component of the decisions for supporting PEAs with TA/PD resources. This would directly support PEA SSIP Team initiatives and learning communities. It may also lead to a greater collection of systems data from non-SSIP Literacy Plans and PSM Drilldowns to expand the awareness of systems for a more reliable representation of learning community systems in Arizona and a more calibrated system of aligning PEA needs with supports.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Anticipated barriers include the available time capacity constraints and the development of systemic alignment at the SEA.

To address the barrier of capacity, the SEA SSIP Team will work with ESS leadership to prioritize the different initiatives and to address them accordingly. If capacity does not allow for the dashboard to be completed and used for collaboration by the anticipated timeline, then the timeline will have to be adjusted. Likewise, as ESS and MOWR continue to work through capacity issues and the development of systems realignment, if the dashboard is created before stakeholders in the realignment are ready to consider the dashboard toward systemic support, then the dashboard will be maintained until the system alignment and capacity allow for the dashboard to be used toward TA/PD support.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The SEA SSIP Team went back to the SY 2020–2021 SSIP Survey to examine how SSIP PEAs reported COVID-19 as a barrier to SSIP Action Plan initiatives. The Team found that, when asked generally about implementation barriers, about 7 of every 10 responses referred to COVID-19 variables, including prolonged shutdowns during the year, online/hybrid instruction, poor teacher and student attendance and engagement, and the inability to provide appropriate interventions and pursue initiatives. This data will be used in further consideration of SSIP calculations.

For additional context for the SiMR and systemic analysis in SSIP PEAs, the SEA SSIP Team analyzed the proficiency gaps between SpEd and non-SpEd groups at both the SSIP PEA and Arizona-PEA levels according to the SiMR calculation. After disaggregating the group of non-SSIP PEAs in Arizona, the SEA SSIP Team found that the non-SpEd student group reported a proficiency increase of 1.4% between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. In comparison, the SpEd group reported a proficiency increase of 0.8% during this time. While both groups increased, the gap between students with disabilities and their same-aged peers in Arizona non-SSIP PEAs also increased. In further analyzing the group of SSIP PEAs, the SEA SSIP Team found that the non-SpEd student group reported a proficiency decrease of -6.8% between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. In comparison to the proficiency decrease of -3.76% by the SSIP SpEd group, while both groups decreased, the gap between student with disabilities and their same-aged peers in SSIP PEAs also decreased. The comparative proficiency decrease of the non-SpEd student group in SSIP PEAs may indicate that factors such as COVID-19 and accompanying variables may have had a dynamic effect on all students in SSIP PEAs during the reporting period.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Alissa Trollinger

Title:

Deputy Associate Superintendent, Exceptional Student Services

Email:

alissa.trollinger@azed.gov

Phone:

602-364-4004

Submitted on:

04/24/24 5:34:57 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Arizona 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
75.00%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	14	70.00%
Compliance	20	16	80.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	25%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	93%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	25%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	86%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	38%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	93%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	18%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	87%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	26	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	74	1

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	Not Valid and Reliable	N/A	0
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	95.60%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.05%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	67.05%	YES	0
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	96.15%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=5% and <10% for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and >=90% and <95% for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Arizona

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	0	0
4B	0	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	19
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	24

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	24
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9615
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	96.15

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Arizona

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	189
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	111
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	33
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	111
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	11
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	1
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	67

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	101
(2.1) Mediations held.	46
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	16
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	7
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	30
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	27
(2.2) Mediations pending.	7
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	48

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	73
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	8
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	4
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	2
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	2
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	9
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	62

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	4
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	0
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	4

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

When looking at year over year data, two areas showed an increase. Below are the data notes explaining the increase. Mediation During this reporting year, ADE/Exceptional Student Services (ADE/ESS) updated the web-based State Complaint Forms by providing an option for parents and public education agencies (PEAs) to request mediation as an additional resolution option. Following the addition of a mediation option to web-based Complaint forms, 40% of Complainants pursued participation in mediation, resulting in an increase in the overall number of mediation requests. Due Process Due Process Complaints continue to increase as the impact of COVID-19 school closures manifests at the school and student levels. State Education Agency (SEA) personnel data review and analysis indicates that the increase in Due Process Complaints filings is likely associated with continued staffing shortages. These shortages have negatively impacted the implementation of IEP-outlined special education service delivery and provision of accommodations beyond the one-year lookback of a State Complaint. Additionally, the SEA added a dedicated parent complaint mechanism that is not explicitly focused on special education matters but has allowed parents an additional pathway to file complaints with ADE/ESS.

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Arizona

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>