STATE BOARD ADVISORY PANEL
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

The Arizona State Advisory Panel for Special Education held a meeting at Casa Grande Middle School, Conference Room, 350 W. McMurray, Casa Grande, AZ on January 15, 2002, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Members Present

Caroline Alcaida
Ida Fitch
Linda Gasten
Valerie Huber
Linda Irvin
Barbara Kilian, Co-chair
Kathleen McCoy, Vice-chairperson
Bill Rabe
Sue Tillis
Susan Vanatta
June Wood

Members Absent

Michael Bashaw
Ron Cleveland
Dennis deNomme
J'Anne Ellsworth
Dan Murrell
Terisa Rademacher, Co-chair
Mary Schabarum
Marta Urbina
Penny Webb

Others Present

Lynn Busenbark, ADE/ESS
Steve Mishlove, ADE/ESS
Jeannette Zemeida, ADE/ESS
Joan McDonald
Shirley Hilts-Scott, PINS/PALS
Tess Alan, ADE/ESS

Some members of the general public were in attendance

Minutes Approved (As Read)(As Amended)

Chairperson: _____
Signature Date

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
1. Call to order.	Barbara Kilian, Co-Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.	1. None.
2. Approval of November 27, 2001 minutes.	Bill Rabe made a motion and seconded by Kathleen McCoy to approve the November 27, 2001, minutes. This was done after Shirley Hilts-Scott's presentation as there was not a quorum until 10:05 am.	2. Motion carried.
3. Public comment.	Barbara Kilian welcomed the public in attendance. She explained to those present the procedures for making a comment. Anyone wishing to comment on an agenda item was asked to fill out a brief questionnaire stating which agenda item they wished to comment on. That person would then be called on when that item was discussed.	3. None
4. Certification/Recertification	Joan McDonald, Administrator for Educational Services, Tolleson Elementary School District, spoke to the panel regarding Certification/Recertification. She represents Special Education of the State Board Advisory Committee for Certification. She reviewed the procedure for bringing recommendations for change to the State Board: • Issue is referred to Dr. Charles Wiley, Associate Executive Director for Education Programs and Assessment, State Board of Education. • Issue is referred to the ADE Certification Office for technical review. • Single issue no action is taken. • Review of broader issues will go to the Advisory Committee for review and decision regarding a recommendation for a rule change or not. • Recommendations from the committee go to the State Board. • If the State Board contemplates changing the rule, it goes to open docket. • Notice of proposed rule change(s) go to the State Board. • If the State Board approves the item, public hearings are scheduled. • After the public hearings the State Board can adopt and close the record, they can leave the item open for further input, or they can terminate. • If the State Board adopts the item it goes to the AG' s office for up to 60 days of review and certification. This entire process can take anywhere from 8 months to 4 years. Joan discussed the special education issues that are currently before the State Board and provided a handout outlining the specific rules, including the proposed changes to the rules. One of the issues is a concern expressed for certification for school psychologists who are interested in applying for positions (as an example) as Director of Special Education. An Advisory committee was	4. None

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	formed by the State Board to look at the recommendation. A lot of school districts require a Supervisory Certificate in order to be placed in a position of Special Education Director. Many school psychologists are not eligible for the certificate, however, because they have never been classroom teachers. Joan went over the handout regarding R7-2-613, Administrative Certificates, pointing out the bolded and crossed out changes. The word "certificate" has been crossed out in B.3.a, which states (as corrected): A standard elementary, secondary special education or school psychologist certificate. 3c was also changed to include school psychology experience. The change was recommended because quite often some of the best candidates for Director of Special Education are school psychologists. The changes were not supported beyond the Supervisory Certificate because the Advisory Committee felt that candidates for a Principals Certificate should have teaching experience. The changes to these rules will be sent in package recommendation to the State Board in the spring. The other issue that impacted special education is requirements for speech and language certificates. Joan went over the recommended changes for this requirement. Basically, there were some technical corrections. While everyone wants the most qualified people in the field, they have to be realistic. In the school districts, there are often a lot of bachelor's level people that are very qualified to deliver speech and language services with the supervision of a licensed and/or a clinical competency certificate-based individual. While the committee supports 200 clock hours be required, they removed "as a part of an accredited university program" because they felt that it would give districts flexibility. It would be acceptable for the individual to be supervised by a validated clinical competent person or a state-licensed speech therapist. Sue Tills questioned why the committee was interested in this issue. Joan addressed the issue of the shortage of individuals with their licensure in the speech and language field but are working toward it. This would allow the districts a little more flexibility in hiring in order to cover the shortage of licensed individuals. A question and answer session followed this part of Joan's presentation. The last issue that Joan discussed with SEAP was regarding Educational Interpreters for the hearing impaired. The licensure for interpreters through the licensure office pretty much excludes educational interpreters. It is Joan's understanding that it was done with the understanding that the Certification Office would pick up on some of those requirements if in fact a student needed an interpreter specifically trained to work with students in a public school setting. The skills are very different for a court interpreter as opposed to classroom interpreting. After much discussion and information that was shared, the	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome

committee came to the conclusion that some standards are needed. They also wanted to give the schools some flexibility. The Certification Advisory Committee (regarding Educational Interpreters for the Hearing Impaired) is recommending that the State Board of Education adopt the following requirements for Educational Interpreters for the Hearing Impaired: "National-level certification OR Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) score of 3.0". The recommendation for this issue is for this recommendation to go into effect in 2005.

SEAP members brought up issues that they would like Joan to take to the Certification Advisory Committee.

The issues include:

Sue Tillis:

- Any educational certificate ought to have a requirement for some awareness of students with disabilities because of the fact that those students could be in regular classrooms.

June Wood:

Voiced a concern that untrained individuals are being accepted into universities' education programs without any sort of teaching background, due to the shortage of special education teachers. Sited an example of student with background of two years training in nursing being accepted to special education teaching program at junior level. This person now has only two years to acquire not only regular education teaching skills but special education knowledge as well. In June's opinion, this is not possible.

Plans to recommend a course at NAU (where she is an instructor) that would teach the students different methods for working with students with learning differences.

- Proposes that there be some psychological criteria for regular ed/special ed teachers to make sure the individuals are prepared to work with all children.

Unidentified voice:

- Propose issue of separating requirements for those people who wish to be certified at a secondary level and those people who wish to be certified K-8.

Bill Rabe:

- Recommend that school administrators be required to have a class in special education.

Joan suggested that SEAP suggestions be put in writing. Kathleen McCoy volunteered to draft a document with the recommendation of the SEAP members. She will then send copies to members so it can be edited into a final draft to be sent to Joan McDonald. Kathleen requested that Jeannette Zemeida send her a transcription of the recommendations made during the meeting.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
5. PINS/PALS Presentation	Shirley Hilts-Scott, a Parent Information Network Specialist (PINS), Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services presented information on the PINS and PALS networks to the SEAP members. She started out by telling the panel that she is one of six individuals in the state that is designated as a PINS Specialist. PINS serve all 15 counties in Arizona. Shirley shared information regarding the PINS website which is located at: www.ade.az.gov/ess/pinspals/pinsspecialists.asp. She stated that mediation documents could also be found on the website as well. This is an area that the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) and Exceptional Student Services (ESS) are putting more emphasis into right now because of the number of administrative complaints that have been filed. Some of the things that PINS do: • Consultation to parents, schools, agencies, and colleges/universities • Workshops and trainings • Assist in planning disability awareness programs • Help form parent groups • Provide general and disability-specific information • Collaborate with agencies • Video library – loan and dub Parents are Liaisons to Schools (PALS): • Parents of students receiving special education services • Nominated by school district or charter school • Work with Special Education director in their school district and PINS to improve parent involvement • Provide feedback to ADE/ESS from parents on systemic needs • Keep local parents informed re: special education activities and information • Develop and support local special education activities for families Barbara Kilian asked Shirley about PINS support for parents of incarcerated youth. Shirley informed her that it is possible and gave her some contact information.	5. None

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	Outcomes of the PINS/PALS initiative: • Parents are more knowledgeable • School staff and parents have a local contact for resources • ADE/ESS has a broader network for information getting out to parents • Collaborators (act of working together) – work with parents and school districts Shirley went over several of the resources that are available from PINS. The information on how to access the resources is on the PINS/PALS website. (Several of the documents used by Shirley during her presentation will be mailed to SEAP members before the March meeting.)	
6. Reopening State Regulations	Lynn Busenbark distributed a document containing ideas that have been suggested for changes to the state rules for special education. She explained the format of the document. At this point, the rules for change have not been reopened. It is an official process that the State Board does and once that occurs official comment would come into play. Lynn recommended to SEAP that before ESS goes before the State Board to have the rules reopened that all the opinions on the changes be collected first. Lynn went over some of the changes that had been recommended. There was a question and answer session regarding some of the proposed changes. Steve Mishlove stepped into the discussion regarding changes to the surrogate parent section to give SEAP members some information about current surrogate parents. A current legislation session put a statute into place that requires all surrogate parents to have Class 1 fingerprinting completed. ESS had a listing of approximately 800 surrogate parents. A sizable portion of that list was not active surrogate. ESS had gone through an extensive process in determining those who are active and those who are not. Then the statute was created. A letter was sent to each surrogate parent on the list informing them that they needed to have the Class 1 Fingerprint completed by January 1, 2002. They were informed that ADE would pay for the fingerprinting. At this time, only 100 of the 800 on the list have completed the Class 1 fingerprinting. ESS is continuing its efforts to have more the surrogate parents acquire the Class 1 fingerprinting. ESS will be sending out a survey to all public education agencies (PEAs) to determine how many active surrogate parents are currently representing children with disabilities in the state of Arizona. ADE/ESS is also currently advertising statewide for more surrogate parents. It was discussed that a foster parent only needs a Class 2 fingerprinting but if they chose to become a surrogate parent that they would then need to get a Class 1 fingerprint.	6. None

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	There was a discussion regarding the acquisition of a surrogate parent for a child and how a school district went about doing that. Currently, surrogate parents are court-appointed. Steve informed the SEAP panel about possible changes to the system on assigning surrogate parents. Roberta Brown, the ADE/ESS specialist in charge of the voucher program, is currently working on suggestions for changes to sections R7-2-402, R7-2-403, and R7-2-404. Those changes will be provided to SEAP when they are available. There were two sections missing from the packet of information provided to SEAP. One section refers to the complaint process and the other refers to the Braille rule. They will be included in the next packet of information sent out to SEAP. Sue Tillis asked that the document listing the rules and suggested changes be e-mailed to the SEAP members so that they could disseminate them to other interested parties. It was also determined that Lynn would include a list of instructions on how to make the suggested changes so that current suggested changes would not be eliminated from the document. Steve added that there is currently no rule for Braille. That is currently being worked on. Steve addressed section R7-2-405 regarding the Due Process standards. He discussed some of the information that he and Randy Lazar had shared with SEAP at the November 27, 2001 SEAP meeting held in Phoenix regarding moving from a two-tier to a one-tier system for Due Process. Steve and Randy met to discuss the language of the change to the rules from a one-tier to a two-tier system. That language has been included on the right-hand side of the document (changes were bolded). However, SEAP members can make any changes that they would like. A new component of the complaint investigation procedure that has come about due to the settlement agreement of the class action lawsuit is Early Resolution. ESS contracted with two individuals who are specifically assigned to address the complaint as soon as it is made to ESS. Within 7 calendar days they contact the parent to see if they are willing to try to resolve the issue with the school and then they contact the school. If the parent and school are willing to use this method the ESS representative acts as an arbitrator. ESS has been able to resolve, through the Early Resolution process, approximately 50 percent of the complaints that have come to the attention of ESS. A member of the attending public, Mr. Robert Perry, asked if the general public was also allowed to send in suggestions. Lynn Busenbark told him that suggestions were welcomed from any person interested in doing so.	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
7. Traumatic Brain Injury	ESS has received a grant for a federally funded Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) project. The primary party involved is a teaching research out of Eugene, Oregon. The research is being done in Flagstaff. The research staff is currently attempting to put together a TBI Resource Team. They are surveying the community to find individuals who have some knowledge of traumatic brain injuries. ESS is currently attempting to find a TBI Coordinator. At this point in time, no one has been hired. Once an individual is hired, they will be responsible for helping the research team put together the Resource Team.	7. None
8. Secure Care Presentation	Barbara Kilian supplied the SEAP members present with a handout that pointed out that one of the responsibilities of SEAP is advising on students with disabilities in adult prisons. Barbara Kilian is the representative for that category of SEAP and gave her presentation so that SEAP members would be more aware of the conditions under which these students are taught. Dr. Tess Alan, Secure Care Coordinator, Exceptional Student Services, Arizona Department of Education gave SEAP members information on juveniles 14-22 years old in the adult correctional facilities. Dr. Alan passed out copies of the 21st Annual Report to Congress. The report outlined the characteristics of students with disabilities in correctional facilities. The report also gave statistics about the percentage of students in correctional facilities that receive special education training. Dr. Alan went over the information in the report in detail. The percentage of special education students in an incarcerated setting is much higher than in a regular school population. Dr. Alan answered questions from the SEAP members. Barbara presented a slide show that showed the “classrooms” the special education students are taught in while in adult correctional facilities.	8. None
9. SAVE Monitoring	Lynn Busenbark spoke to SEAP regarding the Self Assessment and Verification Experience (SAVE). This is a new monitoring system that ESS is currently trying with the school districts and charter schools. The SAVE monitoring is a modification of an ADE CCPR monitoring. Essentially the same monitoring elements are looked at but the school staff, instead of the ADE team, is responsible for collecting the monitoring information and reporting it back to ADE. Once the school staff has finished, the ADE Specialist will then go in and verify the information. The intent of the SAVE monitoring is to keep what ESS needs from the traditional monitoring but give the ESS staff time to add some more technical assistance to the school district.	9. None

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	There are several school districts currently going through the SAVE monitoring. Next year, 18 out of 36 LEAs/PEAs will be eligible to go through the SAVE process. Lynn went over areas that were considered when considering a district for a SAVE monitoring. Some of the indicators considered included: past willingness to work with specialists; relationship with PINS (recommendation of PINS members); and complaints and due process. ESS is currently working on some motivators so that districts will be interested in doing a SAVE monitoring. Some possibilities are stipends of approximately $1,000; give districts the option to skip certain fields. Sue Tillis shared her district's experience with the SAVE monitoring.	
10. Arizona Department of Education reports: ♦ Reports and Summary of Current Events	• Racial Ethnic Survey results sent out to PEAs • Cost Study is being expanded to include some A-weight information --Data needed to show legislators that not enough money is going to those students	10. None.
11. Adjournment	At 1:55 pm Kathleen McCoy left the meeting. Barbara Kilian adjourned the meeting before she left to ensure that a quorum was present at adjournment. Following Kathleen's departure Barbara continued with the rest of the agenda.	11. Adjournment.
10. Arizona Department of Education reports: ♦ Reports and Summary of Current Events	Continued • Arizona Center for Professions in Education (Teacher Recruitment and Retention Project) is meeting with representatives from institutes of higher education to try to figure out how they can assist in addressing teacher shortages; in a separate meeting they also met with representatives of community colleges to cover this issue for community colleges as well • School-to-Work Transition Grant is ending; ESS will be using carry-over funds from the grant to obtain a state-of-the-state view of where Arizona is with regards to participation in transition throughout the state • 100 LEAs were randomly selected to participate in the Transition Evaluation Training which will be conducted by Ed O'Leary, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center • New Dispute Resolution brochure will be available soon • IDEA funding is increasing $18 million from last year; new amount is $111 million; most of it will go directly to schools • SELECT courses are doing well; offered on Internet • New staff members in ESS	10. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome

	• SPAR
	  • On back burner for Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) -- tied up in state budget issues
	  • Office of Strategic Planning and Budget (OSPB) – report by phone only – all recommendations supported
	  • No new funding due to budget constraints
	  • Recommended continuation of ESS program	

12. Monitoring Report.	Two full-compliance monitorings for SY 2001-02 have been completed.	12. None
13. Transition.	Nothing to discuss during this meeting. Topic tabled.	13. None
14. Assessment	Alternate Assessment videotapes have been mailed out. Schools can make copies of the tapes if they need to. Lynn recommended that the teachers view the AIM-A tape first as the tapes are lengthy. AIMS-a reporting should be much easier this year and there are only two forms that have to be filled out. All the forms needed are on the ADE/ESS website. All reporting will be done online. The state of Arizona is moving from a student accountability system into a school accountability system. Superintendent of Public Instruction, Jaime Molera's agenda is to move away from the previous Superintendent's agenda of student accountability to a school accountability system, which is tied to Proposition 301. This will bring about some changes as to how information about students with disabilities is used. It is much more difficult to incorporate such things as out-of-level testing and non-standard administration into a system accountability. There is a lot of work to do in this area. Lynn and SEAP members discussed concerns regarding the new accountability.	14. None.
15. Statewide LD Criteria.	Robert Perry, a member of the audience, wanted to know what SEAP's plans are for developing a statewide LD criteria. He wanted to know if Arizona was waiting to hear what OSEP is doing in this area. Lynn Busenbark answered his question by letting him know that SEAP is waiting to hear what is currently being done on the federal level before moving forward with this item. A discussion ensued regarding this issue. The general consensus is that the item will stay on the agenda but is indefinitely tabled until further information is received by OSEP regarding this issue.	15. None
16. Classification of Child with a Disability through age 9.	Nothing to discuss during this meeting. Topic tabled.	16. None
17. Parent Involvement in SEAP.	A discussion was held regarding SEAP member count – parents vs. members of the community. Lynn Busenbark and Barbara Kilian will talk to Corrine Velasquez, State Board Office, regarding this issue.	17. None

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
18. Next meeting and agenda items.	The following items were proposed for the agenda for the March 19, 2002 meeting: ♦ Data collection for end of year ♦ Continuous monitoring improvement, federal monitoring process -- John Copenhaver, ♦ Due process rule ♦ Assessment ♦ OSEP Monitoring Report ♦ Statewide LD criteria ♦ Classification of a Child with a Disability through age 9 ♦ Parent Involvement ♦ Transition	18. None.