



Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) for Infants and Toddlers

ICC Committee Meeting Minutes

January 20, 2023, 11:30am - 12:30pm

Members

Kelly Lalan (Present)
Suzanne Perry (Present)
Charlene May (Present)
Stacy Reinstein (Present)
Laurie SHook (Present)
Amber Neubauer (Present)
Jaime Pack-Adair (Present)
Lana Graber (Present)

Annette Yazzie (Present)
Janet Vilorio (Present)
Jessica Love (Present)
Kendra Benedict (Present)
Stephanie Collier (Present)
Sarah Greene (Present)
Kristin Chase
Sonia Samaniego

AzEIP Staff

Virginia Roundtree
Caroline Nailor-Oglesby (Present)
Erica Melies (Present)
Lori Gousse
Deborah Daniels
Chandelle Curtis (Present)

Tanya Goitia (Present)
Lisa Casteel (Present)
Jeremiah Hale (Present)
Kellie Verdicchio (Present)
Karylann Converse (Present)

Minutes

1. Call to Order - Lana Graber called the meeting to order at 11:37am
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Public Comment Notice

4. ICC Updates

- A reminder that 2023 timelines were approved and posted online AzEIP/ICC. The minutes were also posted from November 18, 2022.
- Minute Approval from November 18, 2022
 - Laurie Shook moved to vote on the minutes
 - Sara Green seconded the motion
 - Kelly Lalan - Aye
 - Suzanne Perry - Aye
 - Charlene May
 - Stacy Reinstein - Aye
 - Laurie SHook - Aye
 - Amber Neubauer - Aye
 - Jaime Pack-Adair - Aye
 - Lana Graber - Aye
 - Annette Yazzie - Aye
 - Janet Vilorio - Aye
 - Jessica Love - Aye
 - Olivia Lindly - Aye
 - Kendra Benedict - Aye
 - Stephanie Collier - Aye
 - Sarah Greene - Aye
 - Members voted of approval of minutes. The Board has approved the minutes from November 18, 2022

5. AzEIP Updates

- SPP/ARP presentation
 - Components of the SPP/ARP
 - Under IDEA Sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) and 642 and under 34 C.F.R. § 80.40, the lead agency's SPP/ARP must report on the State's performance under its SPP/ARP and contain information about the activities and accomplishments of the grant period for a particular federal fiscal year (FFY)
 - The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report has many components.
 - The Introduction/Executive Summary
 - Indicator 1: Timely Service
 - Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments
 - Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes
 - Indicator 4: Family Involvement
 - Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)
 - Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)
 - Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline
 - Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition (Transition Planning)
 - Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition (Notification to the State Education Agency)
 - Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Education (Transition Conference)
 - Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions
 - Indicator 10: Mediation
 - Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan
 - State Systemic Improvement Plan

- SSIP is posted on the website
- The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is part of the State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report and is a requirement for all states receiving federal funds for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act programs. The SSIP is a comprehensive multi-year plan developed by states focused on improving results for children with disabilities.
- It is important to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services.
- Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11
- The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases. There are three phases in the submission of the SSIP:
 - Phase I analysis included the following components: Data analysis; infrastructure analysis; state-identified measure result (SIMR); coherent improvement strategies; and a theory of action
 - Phase II included the multi-year plan addressing the following components: infrastructure development; supports for implementing evidence-based practices; and an evaluation plan
 - Phase III includes the evaluation of the implementation of coherent improvement strategies from years 3 through 6. Components include results of the ongoing evaluation; extent of progress; and revision to the SSIP
- AzEIP's 5-year goal is that children who receive services through our program will have a greater than expected growth in their social-emotional development
- Arizona Early Intervention Program SSIP is posted on the website at <https://des.az.gov/services/developmental-disabilities/early-intervention/reports>
- Annual Report Certification
 - The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) advises and assists the Department of Economic Security, Arizona Early Intervention Program (DES/AzEIP) and its partner agencies to administer, promote, coordinate, and improve early intervention for families and professionals. One of the areas ICC and the DES collaborate is the preparation and submission of the annual report to the Governor and the Secretary on the status of the early intervention program operated within the state
 - Under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. §303.604(c), the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) of each jurisdiction that receives funds under Part C of the IDEA must prepare and submit to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) and to the Governor of its jurisdiction an annual report on the status of the early intervention programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families operated within the State. The ICC may either: (1) prepare and submit its own annual report to the Department and the Governor, or (2) provide this certification with the State lead agency's State Performance

Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) 1 under Part C of the IDEA. This certification (including the SPP/APR) is due no later than February 1, 2023

- Arizona ICC may submit its own annual report, or use the AzEIP SPP/APR for 2021 in lieu of submitting the ICC's own annual report. By completing the certification, the ICC confirms that it has reviewed the AzEIP SPP/APR for accuracy and completeness
- If the ICC is using the State's Part C SPP/APR and it disagrees with data or other information presented in
 - the State's Part C SPP/APR, the ICC must attach to this certification an explanation of the ICC's
 - disagreement and submit the certification and explanation no later than February 1, 2023
 - The ICC Chairperson signs and date that the Annual Report Certification and the annual report or SPP/APR has been provided to the Governor
 - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/10xVWhfV4IkJIGBZ87smGTmoapyQnzXXD/view>
- OSEP Determination
 - The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) uses information from the SPP/APR, information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information to annually determine if the state. IDEA details four categories for the Secretary's determinations. A State's determination may be:
 - Meets requirements and purposes of the IDEA
 - Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B or Part C of the IDEA
 - Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B or Part C of the IDEA
 - Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B or Part C of the IDEA
 - IDEA identifies technical assistance or enforcement actions that the Department must take under specific circumstances for States that are not determined to "meet requirements." If a State "needs assistance" for two or more consecutive years, the Department must take one or more enforcement actions, including, among others, requiring the State to access technical assistance, designating the State as a high-risk grantee, or directing the use of State set-aside funds to the area(s) where the State needs assistance
 - If a State "needs intervention" for three or more consecutive years, the Department must take one or more enforcement actions, including among others, requiring a corrective action plan or compliance agreement, or withholding further payments to the State. Any time a State "needs substantial intervention" the Department must take immediate enforcement action, such as withholding funds or referring the matter to the Department's inspector general or to the Department of Justice
- Next Steps
 - Together with the support of the ICC and other stakeholders, AzEIP will continue to work on the priorities and initiatives outlined in the State Systematic Improvement Plan Evaluation Plan. More will be discussed at

the next full ICC meeting.

- One of the areas that the Office of Special Education Programs monitors is broad stakeholder input. Throughout the year, AzEIP will be soliciting input on various initiatives relevant to the implementation of early intervention in Arizona
 - There will also be ongoing activities about next year's SPP/APR and SSIP. The goal is to get a head start preparing for next year's submission. If there are any required action steps from OSEP for FFY 2021 SPP/APR; then that will be included in our ongoing discussion with stakeholders
- Questions regarding SPP/APR from Council
 - Question: A big portion of what was talked about was if the stated need intervention for two or more years and three or more years. What does that look like, and where is Arizona currently in that process?
 - Answer: Arizona meets the requirements. We do not have any corrective action plan in place. Arizona has been doing well over the last year. We were under a corrective action plan two years ago, but that was closed out last year.
 - Question: Are there any areas of concern in the SPP/APR.
 - Answer: For AzEIP getting more broad input from our stakeholders was discussed. We will reach out more to families. Looking at families that have children in early intervention and trying to recruit them to ICC. We want ICC to continue to support us, so the next follow-up meeting would be to look up our SSIP plan.
 - Question: This document is going to be sent out prior to February 1, 2023. What is intended to come back is another determination, whether we meet requirements, need assistance, need intervention, or substantial intervention. Can you give us a probability of what you think you think we are going to come back with this presentation? Do you think we are doing well for the fiscal year 2021?
 - Answer: Overall Arizona is doing well. There are monthly meetings with the Office of Special Education program contact person. There have not been any issues or concerns that have come up from OSEP. There are we the TA National Specialist. We can not identify anything that will come back.
 - Question: The areas of concern are recorded as slippage. Was there a particular slippage in areas that you were not expecting or did you anticipate the results that you received?
 - Answer: There was slippage in a couple of indicators. The firstly one is for our timely services. We did not meet our target of 100%. With all the things going on with the pandemic and personnel shortages. We changed the definition of timely services right when the monitoring period started. We decreased the amount of time providers have to complete timely service from 45 days to 30 days. This occurred after we reviewed the data and received stakeholder feedback. This was done to help support getting children into services timely. There was slippage with child outcomes. We have been seeing that nationally as well. We are trying to increase the in-person services. Secondly, there was slippage in our family involvement outcomes. This was primarily centered on the family survey. There were indicators where families reported less agreement with two of the three family outcomes. For the other targets, there was no slippage. It has been approved since last year.
 - Question: There is a question about the early childhood transition. There is one section that said provides the time period in which the data was collected. That

section of the report on page 43 states that the data reflect all children statewide potentially eligible for Part B and exiting from April 1, 2022, through June 1, 2022. This is a small period of time. Can you explain that?

- Answer: We look at one quarter to go in-depth to go into monitoring. When we look at the data and how it compares to the full year, we find that it actually corresponds well and the numbers are almost identical. It is only a sample, we do still look at the whole year. We are going further in-depth with the monitoring.
- Question: You discussed the Challenges and successes and things that were able to report this year that were improvements and better indicator results.
- Answer: For AzEIP, the fact that we did not see a further drop in timely services, although we did have slippage. We expected more slippage than we actually got. Even though we did not hit the target we think it was a success. In terms of settings, we do well as a state. Our data was more in line with what we typically expect to see. Regarding our 45-day timeline, we did not hit the target but we are doing well with compliance. For the transition outcomes, we are moving in a positive direction. We can have a higher percentage of compliance if we can figure out what the data anomalies are.

6. ICC Vote on certifying or not certifying the SPP/SPR

- Charlene proposes to vote on the SPP/SPR
- Sarah Green seconded the motion
- Laurie Shook moved to vote on the minutes
- Sara Green seconded the motion
- Kelly Lalan - Aye
- Suzanne Perry - Aye
- Charlene May
- Stacy Reinstein - Aye
- Laurie SHook - Aye
- Amber Neubauer - Aye
- Jaime Pack-Adair - Aye
- Lana Graber - Aye
- Annette Yazzie - Aye
- Janet Vilorio - Aye
- Jessica Love - Aye
- Olivia Lindly - Aye
- Kendra Benedict - Aye
- Stephanie Collier - Aye
- Sarah Greene - Aye
- The Board has approved the SPP/SPR 2021

7. Public Comment

8. Next Meeting of ICC: Friday, March 24, 2023 - 11:30am - 2:00pm

9. Adjourn - Lana Graber adjourned the meeting at 12:15pm