

## STATE ADVISORY PANEL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

May 22, 2014

@ Quest Conference and Business Center

Agenda Item	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
<p><b>Call to Order</b></p> <p><b>Roll Call</b></p> <p><b>Introduction of Guests, Visitors and New Members</b></p>	<p>Beth Harrison attended with Carol Scally. She will replace Carol on the panel as the Ohio Federation of Teachers (OFT) representative next year. She is the OFT Special Education Representative from Toledo Public Schools</p> <p>Certificates were handed out to members who are leaving the panel: Carol Scally and Tanya Braden.</p>	
<p><b>Panel Business</b></p> <p><b>Approval of March 27, 2014 Minutes</b></p>	<p>March 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes – Handout</p> <p>Tom Ash motioned to approve the minutes; Bill Bauer seconded the motion. Meeting minutes approved.</p>	<p>Meeting minutes will be posted to the ODE website.</p>
<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>Liz Sheets submitted a written public comment related to post-secondary education options for students with disabilities and access to college courses.</p>	<p>The public comment will be reviewed by the SAPEC Executive Committee to determine next steps on June 19<sup>th</sup> at the SAPEC Executive Committee Meeting.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson’s Report</b></p>	<p>Review of various recommendations and feedback provided by the panel over the year. The Executive Committee reviewed this information this morning. Next steps around this work will be sent.</p> <p>Dates for 2014-15 will be sent out in July.</p> <p>SAPEC Meeting Evaluation Results from the March 27, 2014 meeting reviewed.</p>	
<p><b>ODE Report</b></p>	<p>Operating Standards were passed by the SBOE earlier this month. They become effective on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Revisions of guidance, forms and other documents have begun.</p> <p>Dispute Resolution Update 2013-14 – Monica Drvota</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedural Safeguards section changing its name to Dispute</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
	<p>Resolution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures are being revised.</li> <li>• Emphasis on resolution through mediation and facilitation.</li> <li>• Overview of IEP Facilitations, Mediations, Complaints and Due Process Hearings</li> <li>• IEP Facilitation is being renamed Facilitation as it can be used for IEP and Evaluations.</li> <li>• Discussion of Selective Reviews.</li> </ul> <p>Parent Notice of Procedural Safeguards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very rough draft provided to the group for review.</li> <li>• SAPEC has provided feedback on revisions: reduce size, provide links, change format, simplify language and make parent friendly.</li> <li>• Aiming for finalization in July</li> <li>• Members reviewed the draft and provided input for the Ad Hoc Committee to review and consider.</li> </ul> <p>Overview of Proposed/Draft Special Education Monitoring Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selective review is targeted and focuses on a specific area.</li> <li>• Compliance Monitoring for Results: The Path to Results Driven Accountability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasis on districts needs and state focus for improvement</li> <li>○ Provide training and assistance for district to conduct a self-review using tools provided by ODE. District conducts a deep review of their data</li> <li>○ District develops a hypothesis based on Target Area/Creates a Plan of Action</li> <li>○ District receives training and technical assistance in areas of need</li> <li>○ District implements improvement process</li> <li>○ OEC Onsite Progress Review that includes SST Staff (One-Year Timelines begins).</li> <li>○ Adequate Progress or Inadequate Progress?</li> <li>○ If inadequate progress, district advances to level 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Directed CAP, Targeted technical assistance</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ If inadequate progress, level 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Progressive Sanctions</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Embedded consultant for technical assistance.</li> </ul> <p>Updates as a result of SAPEC Ad Hoc Committee feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Third Grade Reading Guarantee FAQ was posted. Webinar held for the state that included specific information for students with disabilities. Discussion of retention and exemption from consequences in Third Grade Reading Guarantee.</li> <li>• Dispute Resolution group reviewed and provided revisions to Mediation brochure. Brochure revised with feedback. Group is planning to work on the Facilitation brochure during this meeting. Hope to have brochures updated in the fall.</li> <li>• Foster Care – Group recommendations are being prepared. Recommendations will be presented in the fall.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Committee Reports</b></p> <p><b>Ad Hoc Committee Reports</b></p> <p><b>Standing Committee Reports</b></p>	<p><b><u>Learning and Achievement Ad Hoc Committees</u></b></p> <p><b>Third Grade Reading Guarantee (TGRG)</b> – Recommend OEC provide or develop guidance to IEP teams (and State Support Teams (SSTs)) on the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who has a significant cognitive disability? Since significant cognitive disability is not a category of disability, be thoughtful and cautious that this TGRG discussion may be the first time parents have encountered this term and definition.</li> <li>• One form of exemption for students with disabilities retention is that the student requires accommodations that are not allowable, what does that mean?</li> <li>• What does the reading improvement plan (RIMP) look like – above beyond IEP – is it more intensely monitored, implemented than a student’s IEP?</li> <li>• What is an appropriate rationale for exemption for retention?</li> </ul> <p><b>KRA-L and Early Learning Assessment</b> - The subcommittee discussed the KRA-L and Early Learning Assessments. Observations regarding child progress were shared and next steps will include an electronic component. Information was shared regarding two sets of documents that reflect Developmental Progressions for children 4-36 months and children 36-72 months. They also discussed implement expectations for teachers.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
	<p><b><u>General Supervision Ad Hoc Committees</u></b></p> <p><b>Dispute Resolution</b> – Review of Mediation Brochure, Facilitation Brochure and Dispute Resolution Chart. Facilitation Brochure work will continue through a webinar over the summer.</p> <p><b>Parent Notice of Procedural Safeguards</b> – How do we ensure parents understand that it is important to read this document? Reviewed feedback provided by the panel.</p>	
<p><b>SAPEC Learning or Information Items:</b></p>	<p><b>State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): Phase 1 – Review of the Process and Intent of Results Driven Accountability (RDA)</b></p> <p>RDA vision from OSEP: To create a balance between the focus on improved results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities while considering compliance as it relates to those results and outcomes.</p> <p>ODE has identified stakeholder groups and organizations to solicit input on RDA and the state’s SSIP. Each state must use stakeholder input and data to identify a focus for improvement. Using Delphi Process to get feedback:  Round 1: Contribute ideas; Round 2: Review first round ideas and revise or add ideas; Round 3: Vote for priority ideas. ODE considers all information and makes final decision on focus area.</p> <p>The panel broke into small groups to review the handout and discuss the 2 draft survey questions for identifying a strategic focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option A: Within the context of results-driven accountability, <u>what strategic focus</u> would yield the most significant improvement in results for students with disabilities if targeted under Ohio’s Systemic Improvement Plan?</li> <li>• Option B: Within the context of results-driven accountability, <u>what is the most important problem</u> that, if addressed, would yield the most significant improvement in results for students with disabilities if targeted under Ohio’s Systemic Improvement Plan?</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
	<p>Each small group reported out highlights of their discussion and suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clarity in instructions</li> <li>• Add data notes or charts</li> <li>• Does the data distract from the question?</li> <li>• Reword Option A to simplify language</li> <li>• Add: Why is it important? What problems would it address?</li> <li>• Make sure preschool is represented in explanations.</li> <li>• Discussion of graduation rates and graduation in four years and those who attend more than 4 years</li> <li>• Add blank space for those who have concerns that are not addressed</li> <li>• Groups preferred option A – more positive and forward thinking</li> <li>• Ensure accessibility of the survey</li> </ul>	
<b>Standing Committee Updates</b>	<p><b>Policies and Procedures Committee</b></p> <p>Reminder about attendance requirements for panel members. Members are expected to attend. Participating by phone is not counted as attendance at the meeting. Review the SAPEC Bylaws for information on requirements.</p>	
<b>Emerging Issues/Unmet Needs</b>	<p>Myrrha Satow: Third Grade Reading Guarantee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns related to the retention component of the Third Grade Reading Guarantee. Research shows that retention increases risk of drop out, behavior problems and decreases self-esteem.</li> <li>• Concerns related to lack of virtual records of the outcomes of the TGRG results to new schools if students move.</li> <li>• Concerns related to testing occupying too much time taking away from instruction time.</li> <li>• Concerns related to resources for kindergarten students to support them.</li> </ul> <p>Marsha Wiley: Deaf-Blind Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the role of trained interveners are not recognized in the state</li> <li>• Concerned that aides are untrained on needs of deaf-blind populations</li> <li>• Concerned that those providing services do not specialize in deaf-blind</li> <li>• Suggestions: Recognize Interveners in the state so at least one member of the IEP team specializes in deaf-blind</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed unmet needs will be reviewed by the SAPEC Executive Committee to determine next steps on June 19<sup>th</sup> at the SAPEC Executive Committee Meeting.</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
<b>Agency Reports</b>	Katrina Bush – Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities  Barbara Weinberg – Ohio Department of Education, Office of Early Learning and School Readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rating of Programs</li> <li>• Working on student learning objectives</li> </ul> Dana Hollis – Ohio Department of Youth Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started apprentice program for cooks in each of the 3 facilities</li> <li>• Project MORE has started where volunteers come in to do one-on-one reading with the youth.</li> <li>• Freedom School – Interactive reading program that brings in college students on the weekend for educational activities.</li> <li>• Difficulties – Internet and Technology</li> </ul>	
<b>Member Announcements</b>	None	
<b>Future Agenda Considerations</b>	None	
<b>Process Check</b>	Look for a link to the survey that will be sent out this afternoon.	Members fill out the survey.
<b>Adjourn</b>	Motion to Adjourn-Tom Ash, seconded by Mary Murray. Meeting adjourned.	