

## Minutes

### **State Advisory Council For the Education of Individuals with Disabilities**

The Arkansas Advisory Council for the Education of Individuals with Disabilities met in the Conference Room at the Victory Building, Suite 445, on Thursday, January 23, 2014.

#### **Council Members Present:**

Sarah Allen  
Christine Archer  
Kathleen Atkins  
Dana Davis  
Courtney Eubanks  
Sandra Porter  
Julie Mayberry  
Jim Moreland  
Kimberly Parker  
Deborah Swink  
Marylene Tate  
Barry Vuletich

#### **Special Education Staff Present:**

Martha Kay Asti  
Samantha Duclos  
Jeanie Donaldson  
Jennifer Gonzales  
Robin Stripling  
Lisa Haley  
Donald Watkins  
Danny Reed  
Courtney Salas-Ford  
Jody Fields  
Alexia Mahomes  
Petra Bland  
Camille Wyllia

#### **Guest(s) Present:**

None

The meeting began at 9:14 A.M. with introductions and welcoming of the Advisory Council members and Special Education staff by Chairperson Deb Swink. Members were asked to look over the October 17<sup>th</sup> minutes. Julie Mayberry requested an amendment to the minutes to reflect the concern she had expressed about playground equipment in all school districts and student access to that equipment for students with disabilities according to the ADA requirements. The amendment was accepted and the minutes will be brought before the council for approval at the April meeting.

**Martha Kay Asti, Associate Director, Special Education Unit** introduced three new employees with the Special Education Unit; Alexia Mahomes, Petra Bland and Camille Wyllia. Alexia is the Administrative Specialist for State Program Development, CAYSI, and Personnel Development. Petra Bland transferred from the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness section to become the Coordinator for Personnel Development. Her responsibilities will include Paraprofessional Modules and training, teacher recruitment and retention, as well as tuition reimbursement programs for individuals enrolled in courses to become certified in the areas of speech, vision and hearing impairments.

**Donald Watkins, Administrator for Grants & Data** introduced Camille “Pepper” Wyllia, who has worked for the School Improvement section for the past 5 years and will be working to assist with finance and fiscal monitoring.

**Jennifer Gonzalez, Coordinator for Behavior, SPDG** reported that SPDG has a new employee, Robin Stripling. Robin was previously with the Bryant School District where she was a Literacy Specialist & Special Education teacher. She will be the Secondary Literacy Specialist and will work with the Literacy Coordinator, Debbie Fleming.

**Ms. Asti** announced the return of Jana Villemez who is coming back to work as the Family Consultant for CAYSI, the Arkansas Deaf-blind Project.

**Dr. Jody Fields** reviewed the draft of the 2012-2013 State Performance Plan (SPP), and reported on each of the indicators from the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR).

### **Indicator 1: Graduation Rates**

The goal for the state is to have an 85% rate or higher. This indicator is reported a year in arrears. The state special education rate is 79.15%. The FY 2012 rate has improved by 3.84 percentage points from the previous year rate's of 75.13%.

### **Indicator 2: Dropout Rates**

Dropout is calculated annually. It is not a 4-year calculation; it is a single year event rate for students from 7<sup>th</sup> grade through 12<sup>th</sup> grade. The target is 4.2%. Data for Arkansas was 2.62%. She noted that there has been a steady decline in the dropout rate. Arkansas met the target by 1.58 percentage points.

### **Indicator 3: Assessment**

- A. The number of districts with the disability subgroup that meets the states minimum size is now 25. Our target did not change, and is 17.15%.  
87 out of 254 (34.25%) districts that have a sub-population met their Accurate Yearly Progress (AYP), which resulted in our meeting the target.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. The target of 95% has not changed. Math was 97.69% and reading was 97.81%. She reported the need for continual efforts to ensure all our students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate academic achievement standards. The target for math is 51.44% and we reached 42.09%. For reading our target is 45.22% and we are at 33.23%. We did not meet the reading target but we did have growth. The proficiency rate for students with disabilities declined in mathematics and literacy for 2012-13. This is the first decline in eight years.

### **Indicator 4: Rates of Suspension and Expulsion**

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. This is a calculation of special education and general education. If special education is greater (at least 1.36% higher) than general education, then they are identified as having a significant difference. This indicator is reported a year in arrears, meaning this data is from 2011-2012. 499 children with disabilities (aged 3-21) had out-of-school suspensions greater than 10 days, or were expelled. Data indicated that 10 of 271 districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsion of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, resulting in a State rate of 3.69%.

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If special education is 4 points higher than general education, they get identified as having a significant discrepancy. Districts that do not meet the criteria are required to review their policies, procedures and practices to make sure this did not lead to the discrepancy. Our target is 0%. 3 districts identified were required to do the self-assessment. A review of their self-assessment did not find anything that was inappropriate, which means Arkansas met the compliance target of 0%.

**Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 (LRE)**

- A. Percent of students inside the regular class 80% or more time of the day. Our target is 59.77% and we reached 52.88%.
- B. Percent of students inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. Our target is 13.18% and our actual rate is 13.18%.
- C. Percent of students in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. We have no control over this calculation because very few students are placed in residential facilities by the district. This includes students who were placed in residential facilities for a reason other than education. 2.57% of children with IEPs were served in separate schools and residential facilities.

**Indicator 6: Percent of Preschool Children in General Education Settings (Pre-School LRE)**

- A. Students (ages 3-5) who attend a regular early childhood program for more than 10 hours per week and get the majority of their special education services or related services in the regular early childhood program. Our target was 31.30% and we reached 30.03%.
- B. Students (ages 3-5) who attend a regular early childhood program for less than 10 hours per week and receive the majority of their special education or related services at a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. Our target was 27.13% and we were at 28.82% of which students are attending a separate special education classroom, separate school or residential facility.

**Indicator 7: Preschool Children with Improved Outcomes**

There are two summary statements per outcome. The first summary statement is of children who entered the program below age expectations and substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turn 6 years of age, or exit the program. The second summary statement is the percent of children functioning within age expectations and outcomes by the time they turn 6 years of age. Of the two summary statements, we have 6 targets total (2 targets per outcome).

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). Summary statement one indicated that our target was 90.5% and we reached 89.21%. For summary statement two, our target was 69.5% and we reached 64.57%.
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy). For summary statement one, our target was 90.5%. We exceeded the target at 90.80%. For summary statement two, our

- target was 60.5% and we reached 57.68%.
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. For summary statement one, our target was 92.5% and we reached 91.4%. On summary statement two, our target was 74.09% and we reached 78.03%.

**Indicator 8: Parental Involvement**

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. We had two targets; one for early childhood and one for school age.

- Early Childhood – Our target was 88% and we reached 92.71%.
- School Age – Our target was 96% and we reached 95%.

**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education that as a result of Inappropriate Identification**

This is the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as the result of inappropriate identification. Our target was 0% and 0% of the districts were identified for this indicator.

**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that are the result of inappropriate identification. We had 6 districts identified for this indicator. All 6 did a self-assessment and were not identified as it being a result of policies, procedures, or practices; therefore, we met our target of 0%.

**Indicator 11: Timeframe between Evaluation and Identification (Child Find)**

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.

- A. Number of children with parental consent to evaluate. Our target was 100% and we reached 99.60%.
- B. Number of children whose evaluation was completed within 60 days. There were 70 students whose evaluations exceeded the 60 day timeline.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 and who are found eligible for Part B who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Our target was 100% and we reached 99.15%.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Percent of youth age 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals. Our target was 100% and we reached 89.07%.

**Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes**

Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

- A. Number of students enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high

- school. Our target was 13.15% and we reached 18.42%.
- B. Number of students in higher education or, are competitively employed. Our target was 49.15% and we reached 43.88%.
  - C. Combination of higher education for some other type of postsecondary education. Our target was 60.15% and we reached 58.13%.

**Indicator 15: Identification and Correction of Noncompliance**

General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. This is another indicator that is reported a year in arrears. Our target was 100% and we reached 100%.

**Indicator 16: Compliant Timelines**

This Indicator is no longer being reported in the APR.

**Indicator 17: Due Process Timelines**

This Indicator is no longer being reported in the APR.

**Indicator 18: Hearing Requests Resolved by Resolution Sessions**

Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. Our target was 55% and we reached 80.00%.

**Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements**

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. Our target was 75% and we reached 83.33%.

**Indicator 20: State Reported Data**

State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. Arkansas was 100% compliant with timely and accurate data reporting. All reports were submitted to OSEP on or before the due dates.

Dr. Fields concluded her presentation and was available to answer questions from the Advisory Council members. There were no additional questions or comments.

Deb Swink announced that the next meeting date for the Advisory Council is April 24, 2014.

Courtney Eubanks gave the motion to adjourn. Sarah Allen seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 1:31 P.M.