

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 17, 2013.

Council Members Present:

Bobby Acklin
Sarah Allen
Christine Archer
Debra Culpepper
Dana Davis
Courtney Eubanks
Bill Glover
Julie Mayberry
Jim Moreland
Deborah Swink
Marsha Tolson
Barry Vuletich

Special Education Staff Present:

Martha Kay Asti
Jennifer Brown
Jody Fields
Brittney Green
Lisa Haley
Sherry Holliman
Danny Reed
Donald Watkins
Debbie Zeringue

Guest(s) Present:

None

The meeting began at 9:24 A.M. with introductions and welcoming of the Advisory Council Members and Special Education Staff by Chairperson Deb Swink. A motion to approve the minutes from the previous forum was initiated. Christine Archer proposed that an additional section be added to the minutes, providing information regarding any additional discussions and comments made during the Advisory Council meeting. She proposed to amend the minutes from the council meeting on October 18, 2012, to reflect her expressed concerns about corporal punishment being an option, used by some districts while not allowed for others. Barry Vuletich made a motion to approve the minutes from October 18, 2012, with the amendments added to the minutes.

Martha Kay Asti, Associate Director, Special Education Unit reported that two new employees will be with the Special Education Unit, Yvonne Green and Samantha Duclos. Yvonne is joining the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section under Lisa Haley. She comes from Texas and is familiar with special education, more specifically, early childhood special education. Samantha Duclos will be the Administrative Assistant for Martha Kay, starting January 22, 2013.

She also reported that the state has a State Performance Plan (SPP) that was developed years ago, and is updated each year along with the Annual Performance Report (APR). OSEP requires that the updated SPP and APR be submitted yearly, by February 1st. This year OSEP gave all states an extension until February 15th. This year states are not required to report on two of the indicators. She introduced Dr. Jody Fields.

Dr. Fields reviewed the draft of the 2011-2012 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 75.31%, which meant of the 4,013 students in the cohort, 3,022 graduated.

The rate for the state, including students with disabilities is about 80%. Last year our special education rate was 75.76%.

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 7th grade through 12th grade, for the equivalent of 14 - 21 years of age. The target is 4.2% and we were 2.92%. There has been a steady drop in the dropout rate. Of 22,709 possible, 662 students dropped out, giving the rate of 2.92%. This is an improvement of 31% since the 2007-2008 calculation.

Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments

- 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%.
50 out of 258(19.38%) 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 98.61% and reading was 98.81%. She reported that our state has always met the participation target.
- 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 45.42%. For reading our target is 45.22% and we are at 36.06%. We did not meet the reading target but we did have growth.

Indicator 4: Suspensions and Expulsions

- 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. Our target is 6.23% and were at 10.26%. This is another indicator that reported a year in arrears, meaning this data is from 2010-2011.
- 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%. 11 districts identified were required to do the self-assessment. A review of their self-assessment did not find anything that was inappropriate.

Indicator 5: Participation/Time in General Education Settings (LRE)

- A. Percent of students inside the regular class 80% or more time of the day. Our target is 59.77% and we reached 53.26%.
- B. Percent of students inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. Our target is 12.51% and our actual rate is 12.52%.
- 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.

Indicator 6: 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. 31% of all early childhood program students attend a regular early childhood program for more than 10 hours per week.
- 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. 27.63% 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). On summary statement one, our target was 90.5% and we reached 89.2%. On summary statement two, our target was 69.5% and we reached 68%.
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy). On summary statement one, our target was 90.5%. We were slightly below the target at 89.81%. On summary statement two, our target was 60.5% and we reached 57.66%.
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. On summary statement one, our target was 92.5% and we reached 91%. On summary statement two, our target was 78.5% and we reached 78%.

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 is the Right of Inappropriate Identification

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, that is the result of inappropriate identification. Our target was 0% and we are at 0% with no districts 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 did meet 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 99.42%.
- B. Number of children whose evaluation was completed within 60 days. There were 103 students whose evaluations exceeded the 60 day timeline.

Indicator 12: Transition between Part C and B

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 99.5%.

Indicator 13: Post School Transition Goals in IEP

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 96.51%.

Indicator 14: Participation in Postsecondary Settings One Year after Graduation

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% and we reached 15.8%.
- B. Number of students in higher education or, are competitively employed. Our target was 49% and we reached 42.95%.
- C. Combination of higher education for some other type of postsecondary education. Our target was 60% and we reached 55.92%.

Indicator 15: Timely 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: Resolution of Written Complaints

Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within the 60 day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. We did not have to report on this indicator this year as OSEP collected this data from another source.

Indicator 17: Due Process Timelines

Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45 day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. We did not have to report on this indicator this year as OSEP collected this data from another source.

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 78.95%.

Indicator 19: Mediations Resulting in Mediation Agreements

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. Our target was 75% and we reached 72.72%.

Indicator 20: Timeliness and Accuracy of State Reported Data

State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Dr. Fields concluded her presentation and was available to answer questions from the Advisory Council members. There were not additional questions or comments.

Deb Swink announced that the next meeting date for the Advisory Council was April 11, 2013. She adjourned the meeting at 1:30 P.M.