

**State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC)
September 30, 2021**

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order

The SAPEC meeting was called to order by new Chairperson Trisha Prunty. Trisha introduced herself as a professor at Bowling Green University and a Parent of a Children with a Disability and welcomed panel members back in person. She thanked members for taking the time to attend in person and for all they do as members of the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children. Trisha welcomed new members who began their terms this year. New members took the time to introduce themselves and their areas of representation. New members in attendance were, Rebecca Hardesty, Haydiee Perkins, & Kathryn Frederick.

Guests in attendance included Stacey Spencer attending for Donna Stelzer and Daria DeNoia attending for Traci Arway.

Sandy Kaufman, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) conducted roll call. Members absent were Valerie Alloy, Kathy Demers, Tina Evans, Donna Foster, Nathan Dedino, Jennifer Hull, Jenny Keesee, Jennifer Kobel, Shannon McGowan, Christina Matthey, Charlotte Perlaky, Judith Sgambati, Melissa Ann Sowers, Noah Trembly, and Janet Uher.

Panel Business

Trisha Prunty, SAPEC Chair, asked for a motion to approve the May 6th meeting minutes. Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.

Trisha went over the meeting expectations. Members were asked to mute their cell phones and state their name when speaking. A reminder was given to panel members that lunch would be 30 minutes. Along with the lunch break there would be an additional break during the meeting. Panel members were reminded that they can take additional breaks as needed throughout the day.

No public comment or unmet needs.

Special Education Indicator Target Setting

Kara Waldron presented on Special education target setting process. Kara began with an overview on the process. The special education indicator target setting process requires states to set targets across indicators for the 2020-2021 through 2020-2025 school years. During the meeting we reviewed eleven indicators, describing what the indicator measures, identifying federal changes to the indicator, reviewing available data, and explaining the rationale for each set of target options. The goal today is to gain informed feedback from panel members. Targets must be reported in the IDEA Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2022. To meet that deadline, the department began the target setting process in August by finalizing the indicator fact sheets and proposing target options. In September, the internal review process for public comment material was completed, stakeholder meetings were held with SAPEC, and the Guiding Coalition. The public comment period will begin in October and virtual stakeholder meetings will be held between November and January to meet the February 1 target deadline.

Indicator 3

The first indicator that Kara discussed was Indicator 3. Indicator 3; Reading and Mathematics Assessments, measures participation and performance of children with Individualized Education Plans on statewide assessments. The first thing to note about why indicator 3 has become so big is because it has been broken out into three grade bands and separated by reading and math. In the interest of time Kara only pointed out key points of the fact sheet and will continue this same process as she reviews each indicator throughout the duration of the meeting. Within the data notes she pointed out the challenges of this indicator, which included that fact that indicator 3 data for the 2019-20 school year were not collected due to the ordered school building closure and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Looking at how Ohio has performed over time. Over three years of data before the pandemic hit, Ohio was well above the average. Then we start to see a decline in performance in high school math.

Kara reviewed the proposed target options with SAPEC panel members, looking at option A for indicator 3a math. The 2020-21 performance will be the target for the first two years due to the impact of the pandemic. After two years, the targets for indicator 3a will increase by 0.50% each year from the prior year through 2025-26, maxing out at 98.00%. Option B for indicator 3a is the more rigorous option. The 2020-21 performance will be the target for the first year. After one year, the target for indicator 3a will increase by 1.00% each year through 2025-26, maxing out at 98.00%. Reviewing the options for indicator 3a reading. Option A will have the 2020-21 performance be the target for the first two years. After two years the targets for indicator 3a will increase by 0.50% each year from the prior year through 2025-26, maxing out at 98.00%. Option B is more rigorous with the 2020-21 performance only being the target for one year and the target for indicator 3a reading will increase by 1% each year.

For indicator 3b Math, option A will have the 2020-21 performance be the target for the first two years (2020-21 and 2021-22) due to the ongoing impact of the pandemic. After two years, the targets for indicator 3b reflect increasing increments of growth from the prior year through 2025-26. Option B is more rigorous. After holding the 2020-21 performance for one year, the targets for indicator 3b reflect increasing increments of growth from the prior year through 2025-26. Indicator 3b reading will follow the same rationale for option A and B as proposed targets.

Reviewing the proposed options for indicator 3c math. Option A would have the 2020-21 performance be the target for the first two years. After the two years, the targets for indicator 3c will increase by 0.50% from the previous year's performance through 2025-26. Option B is the more rigorous option. The 2020-21 performance would be the target for only one year. After that year, the targets for Indicator 3c will increase by 1.00% from the previous year's performance through 2025-26. The proposed target rational option A and B is the same for indicator 3c reading.

Reviewing the proposed options for indicator 3d math. The goal for indicator 3d is to be at or below the target, reflecting a decrease in the gap over time. Option A would have the 2020-21 performance and will be the target for the first two years (2020-21 and 2021-22) due to the ongoing impact of the pandemic. After the two years, the targets for indicator 3d will decrease by 0.50% from the prior year through 2025-26, resulting in a smaller gap between students with disabilities and all students. For option B, the 2020-21 performance would only be the target for one year. After one year, the targets for indicator 3d will decrease by 1.00% from the prior year through 2025-26, resulting in a smaller gap between students with disabilities and all students. The proposed target rational option A and B is the same for indicator 3c reading.

Indicator 1

Kara began discussing indicator 1 before lunch due to being ahead of schedule. Indicator 1 measures the percentage of youth with individualized Education Programs exiting high school with a regular high school diploma. Data notes to consider for indicator 1 are that graduation rates are difficult to compare across years due to changing graduation requirements for the classes of 2018, 2019, and 2020. Looking at how Ohio has compared to the nation, Kara went over this data (which was added to the fact sheets after they were printed), so you will not see this on the printed facts sheets, but you can find them on the Special Education Indicator Target Setting webpage. For the class of 2019, Ohio is second only to Mississippi as the lowest performing state regarding graduation rates which are 48%. This year graduation and dropout rates took a hit for the state, and we will continue to struggle in this area. When looking at how Ohio has performed over time, Ohio has gone from 31% with the class of 16-17 and jumped to 50.6% with the 17-18 class, although we want to acknowledge that we had that increase because we had the additional approaches (pathways) added as requirements for graduation.

Reviewing the proposed target options, the goal for indicator 1 is to be at or above the target. Option A is a more conservative set of targets which will account for the potential for inflated graduation rates due to the changing graduation requirements. Meeting the final target of 60.50% by 2025-26 will require 407 more students with disabilities to graduate by standard requirements. Option B is the more rigorous option. Reaching 70.00% by the 2025-2026 school year would move Ohio from the lowest-performing group of states to the middle-performing group of states in the annual ranking and scoring for state Special Education Determinations by the U.S. Department of Education. meeting the final target of 70.00% by 2025-26 will require 2,364 more students with disabilities to graduate by standard requirements.

Indicator 2

Indicator 2 measures the percentage of youth with Individualized Education Programs dropping out of high school. Some data considerations that were discussed include, the dropout rate is not part of Ohio's Report Card and is not measured for all students. This means data are not available to compare the dropout rate for students with disabilities to students without disabilities. Looking at how Ohio has performed overtime regarding dropouts, the dropout rate has decreased each year since the 14-15 school year and the 19-20 school year. In relation to the targets, the goal is to be at or below each target. In the 14-15 school this would not have been accomplished, however each school year since the goal has been achieved.

Reviewing the proposed targets, the goal for indicator 2 is to be at or below the target. Option A would expect Ohio to reach 15.50% by the 2025-2026 school year and would move Ohio from the lowest-performing group of states to the middle-performing group of states in the annual ranking and scoring for state Special Education Determinations by the U.S. Department of Education. Meeting the final target of 15.50% by 2025-2026 will require 243 fewer students with disabilities across Ohio to drop out of high school. Option B is the more rigorous option in comparison to option A. Ohio would reach 13% by the 2024-2026 school year which would move Ohio from the lowest-performing group of states to the highest-performing group of states in the annual ranking and scoring for state Special Education Determinations by the U.S. Department of Education. Meeting the final target of 13.00% by 2025-26 will require 758 fewer students with disabilities across Ohio to drop out of high school.

Indicator 14

Indicator 14 is the Postschool outcomes indicator which measures the percentage of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect and measures what happened one year after these students left high school. To collect data for this indicator, Indicator 14 is measured using two surveys:

an exit survey conducted just prior to exiting high school and a follow-up survey conducted one year after exiting high school. Ohio's districts are divided into five cohorts to collect exit and follow-up surveys from their students with disabilities once every five years.

Reviewing the proposed targets, the goal for all components of indicator 14 is to be at or above the target. With option A for indicator 14a the Department expects consistent growth over the course of the upcoming target years. Meeting the final target of 39.65% by 2025-26 will require 105 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education within one year of leaving high school. Option B is the more rigorous option. The targets for the 2025-26 year would be the highest targets ever set for indicator 14. Meeting the final target of 40.00% by 2025-26 will require 108 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Looking at indicator 14b, option A would meet the final target of 84.00% by 2025-26 and will require 63 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education or be competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. Option B is more rigorous, meeting the final target of 89.00% by 2025-26 will require 105 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education or be competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Reviewing the proposed targets for 14c. Option A would expect consistent growth over the target years. Meeting the final target of 91.00% by 2025-26 will require 49 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or be competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. Option B being more rigorous, meeting the final target of 96.00% by 2025-26 will require 101 more students with disabilities within the survey sample to enroll in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or be competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

Indicator 4a

Indicator 4a Discipline Discrepancies, measures significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 cumulative days in a school year for children with IEPs compared to children without disabilities. Some data considerations, Indicator 4a is calculated based on the enrollment and discipline data reported by each district in the Education Management Information System (EMIS). When looking at how Ohio has performed over time, between the 2018-19 school year and the 2019-20 school year, Ohio dropped from 25% to 20%.

Kara reviewed the proposed targets for indicator 4a. The goal for indicator 4a is to be at or below the target. The end goal for Option A for indicator 4 is 19% which represents a 1.00% reduction from the 2019-20 data and a 6.00% decrease from the 2018-19 baseline. The Department anticipates a slow decline in the percentage of districts with a discipline discrepancy at or exceeding 1.00% due to changes in business rules. Meeting the final target of 19.00% by 2025-26 will require 4 fewer districts across Ohio to have a discipline discrepancy of 1.00% or greater between students with and without disabilities for three consecutive years. Option B is the more rigorous option with the end goal of 10.00% representing a 5.00% decrease from the 2019-20 data and a 15.00% decrease from baseline. Meeting the final target of 10.00% by 2025-26 will require 5 fewer districts across Ohio to have a discipline discrepancy of 1.00% or greater between students with and without disabilities for three consecutive years.

Indicator 5

Indicator 5, the School-age Least Restrictive Environment Indicator measures the percentage of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in a regular classroom 80% or more of the day, inside the regular class less than 40% of the day and in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. The data from this indicator is collected from the Education Management Information System (EMIS) Child Count, reflecting the October 31 headcount conducted by each district. The Department reports the data for the annual Federal Child Count. Data notes to consider, Indicator 5 targets are based on state-level data and may not appropriately reflect the least restrictive environment needs of the students with disabilities at each district. IDEA requires a full continuum of placement options to be available for students with disabilities based on individual needs. When looking at how Ohio has performed over time for this indicator, for indicator 5a, the goal is to increase the percentage over time. Ohio is slightly below the nation (64.16% compared to 64.82%) in the rate of students with disabilities served inside the regular class $\geq 80\%$ of the day. For indicator 5b, the goal is to decrease the percentage over time. Ohio outperforms the nation (11.90% compared to 12.83%) in the rate of students with disabilities served inside the regular class $< 40\%$ of the day. For indicator 5c, the goal is to decrease the percentage over time. Ohio is slightly behind the nation (3.74% compared to 3.27%) in the rate of students with disabilities served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

Reviewing the proposed targets, the goal for indicator 5 is to be at or above the target. Reviewing option A for indicator 5a, the end goal of 66.00% represents 0.19% more growth than has previously been attained, while maintaining reasonable incremental growth over time in light of programmatic considerations. Meeting the final target of 66.00% by 2025-26 will require 3,018 more school-age children with disabilities to be served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. For option B for indicator 5a data show that over 1.00% of growth per year has previously been attained. The anticipated development and implementation of an integrated model for a statewide multi-tiered system of support may result in more inclusive placements and a less restrictive environment for students with disabilities over time. Meeting the final target of 69.00% by 2025-26 will require 10,577 more school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to be served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.

Reviewing the proposed targets for option A indicator 5b, the end goal of 11.40% represents 0.37% more progress than has previously been attained, while maintaining reasonable incremental reductions over time considering programmatic considerations. Meeting the final target of 11.40% by 2025-26 will require 1,167 school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments. Option B for indicator 5b is more rigorous, with additional strategies and supports in place, 11.00% may be an appropriate target by 2025-2026. Meeting the final target of 11.00% by 2025-26 will require 2,163 school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.

The proposed targets for indicator 5c. Option A's end goal of 3.61% represents 0.01% reduction from the baseline. This option recognizes that Ohio has already achieved a very high level of performance on this measure. Meeting the final target of 3.61% by 2025-26 will require 15 school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments. Option B is a more rigorous option, the end goal of 3.40% represents 0.20% than has been previously attained. Meeting the final target of 3.40% by 2025-26 will require 544 school-age children with disabilities across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.

Indicator 6

Indicator 6, Preschool Least Restrictive Environment measures the percentage of children with IEPs aged 3 4 and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program. Indicator 6 has three newer categories. It previously had two, with home being the new category added. We have never set targets for the preschool children in the home setting. An important data note is the impact of the pandemic regarding preschool enrollment. Enrollment for preschool decreased by 44.6% from the 2019-2020 to the 2020-2021 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. When looking at how Ohio has performed over time for this indicator, for indicator 6a, the goal is to increase the percentage over time. In 2019-20, Ohio substantially outperformed the nation (73.66% compared to 43.75%) in the rate of preschool students with disabilities attending a regular early childhood program. For indicator 6b, the goal is to decrease the percentage over time. In 2019-20, Ohio outperformed the nation (16.20% compared to 26.14%) in the rate of preschool students with disabilities served in separate settings. For indicator 6c, the goal is to decrease the percentage over time. In 2019-20, Ohio outperformed the nation (1.57% compared to 2.17%) in the rate of preschool students with disabilities receiving services at home.

Reviewing the proposed targets, the goal for indicator 6a is to be at or above the target. Reviewing target option A for 6a, Preschool in regular classroom. This option would keep the 2021-22 target at baseline in recognition of the ongoing pandemic and change in measurements, then shows steady improvement to get Ohio back to, and exceeding, the previous 19-20 rate of 74.00%. Meeting the final target of 74.00% by 2025-26 will require 1,366 more children across Ohio to attend regular early childhood programs. Option B for 6a is a more rigorous approach. This approach keeps the 21-22 target closer to the 20-21 data in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic, then shows ambitious improvement each year to get Ohio to 80% by 25-26. Meeting the final target of 80.00% by 2025-26 will require 2,507 more children across Ohio to attend regular early childhood programs.

Reviewing the proposed options for 6b, Preschool separate settings, Option A keeps the 21-22 target at baseline in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic and the change in measurement, then shows steady improvement to get Ohio back to, and exceeding, the previous 19-20 rate at 16.00%. Meeting the final target of 16.00% by 2025-26 will require 559 children across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments. Option B for indicator 6b is more rigorous and keeps the 21-22 target closer to the 20-21 data in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic, then shows ambitious improvement each year to get Ohio to 10% by 25-26. In comparison to Ohio's 2020-21 performance, meeting the final target of 10.00% by 2025-26 will require 1,699 children across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.

In reviewing the proposed options for 6c, Preschool services at home, Option A keeps the 21-22 target at baseline in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic and the change in measurement, then shows steady improvement to get Ohio back to, and exceeding, the previous 19-20 rate at 1.55%. Meeting the final target of 1.55% by 2025-26 will require 271 children across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments. Option B for indicator 6c is more rigorous, this approach keeps the 21-22 target closer to the 20-21 data in recognition of the ongoing impact of the pandemic, then shows ambitious improvement each year to get Ohio to 1% by 25-26. Meeting the final target of 1.00% by 2025-26 will require 376 children across Ohio to move to less restrictive environments.

Indicator 7

Indicator 7, Preschool Outcomes measures the percentage of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships), acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy);

and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. Data for indicator 7 is collected in the Education Management Information System (EMIS) Assessment Record, based on data reported for the Early Childhood Outcomes Summary Form in the fall and spring. To be included in the data set, children must have scores from at least two summary forms.

When looking at the proposed targets, the goal for all components of indicator 7 is to be at or above the target. Reviewing target option A for 7a1, previous targets increased by 0.40% for 7a1, these were reasonably attainable since Ohio met the target for five of the six years. 2020-21 targets reflect the 2019-20 performance, then increase by a slightly larger increment each year thereafter, by approximately 0.10% in 2021-22 and 2022-23, 0.20% in 2023-24, 0.30% in 2024-25, and 0.40% in 2025-26. Meeting the final target of 82.90% by 2025-26 would require 77 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills. Previous targets for 7a2 were too rigorous. Over six years, the target was only met once. Previous targets increased by an increment of 0.60% for 7a2. Targets for 2020-21 through 2022-23 reflect the 2019-20 performance, then increase by approximately 0.10% in 2023-24, 0.20% in 2024-25 and 2025-26. In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 51.40% by 2025-26 would require 39 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in positive social-emotional skills. Option B is the more rigorous option in comparison to option A. Under option B for 7a1, the proposed incremental increase is 0.50% each year. Meeting the final target of 84.50% by 2025-26 would require 187 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills. For option B 7a2, as the previous increments of 0.60% were too rigorous, the proposed incremental increase is 0.40% each year. Meeting the final target of 53.10% by 2025-26, would require 172 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in positive social-emotional skills.

Reviewing the proposed targets for 7b, for option A 7b1, previous targets increased by 0.40% 7b1. These targets were reasonably attainable as Ohio met the target for four of the six years for 7b1. Meeting the final target of 81.90% by 2025-26, would require 75 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. For 7b2, previous targets were too rigorous, with Ohio only meeting the target one of the previous six years. Previous targets increased by an increment of 0.60%. Performance on 7b2 has hovered right around 48.00% for the previous six years. Meeting the final target of 49.00% by 2025-26, would require 43 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. Option B is the more rigorous option in comparison. For 7b1, the proposed incremental increase would be 0.50% each year. Meeting the final target of 83.50% by 2025-26, would require 187 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. For 7b2, previous targets of 0.60% were too rigorous, the proposed incremental increase is 0.40% each year. Meeting the final target of 50.60% by 2025-26, would require 167 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.

Reviewing the proposed targets for 7c, for option A 7c1, previous targets increased by 0.40%. Meeting the final target of 84.30% by 2025-26, would require 71 more preschool children across Ohio to improve their rate of growth in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. For 7c2, previous targets for 7c2 were too rigorous with Ohio only meeting the target for two of six years. Performance on 7c2 has hovered right around 60.00%. Meeting the final target of 60.30% by 2025-26 would require 39 more preschool children across Ohio to function within age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Indicator 8

Indicator 8, Family involvement, measures the percentage 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. Indicator 8 is measured using an online survey for parents of children with disabilities. Here are some data notes to consider: Districts are divided into 6 cohorts. Districts are selected to collect parent involvement surveys once every six years. Also, each year's cohort represents a cross section of districts designed to provide an annual survey sample that is representative of Ohio's overall population of students with disabilities. Ohio has chosen to prioritize disability category in addition to the required priority of race when constructing cohorts.

When reviewing the proposed targets, the goal for indicator 8 is to be at or above the target. Target option A would expect consistent growth over the target years. Meeting the final target of 89.00% by 2025-26 will require 392 more parents to report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Target option B is the more rigorous option in comparison to option A, with higher percentages each target year. Meeting the final target of 94.00% by 2025-26 will require 757 more parents to report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Indicator 15

Indicator 15, Resolution Sessions, measures the percent of due process hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through the resolution settlement agreements. As we look at how Ohio has performed over time, the data has gone down. We are at a 0% data resolution percent for resolutions sessions. We are finding that both parties are less inclined to use resolution sessions. We are seeing a higher rate of mediation agreements. We began to see a decline in the 18-19 school year and then a substantial decrease during 19-20 school year. Most due process requests are withdrawn or dismissed before a hearing occurs, with many cases resolved through mediation.

When reviewing the proposed targets, the goal for indicator 15 is to be at or above the target or to fall within the target range. Target option A is the more conservative option. Staying at a low rate, figuring out what happens over the next few years then getting to 43.05 during the final year. In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 43.05% by 2025-26 will require 13 more resolution sessions to be resolved through resolution settlement agreements. Target option B is a more balanced annual rate, more rigorous and would exceed the baseline. In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target of 48.00% by 2025-26 will require 14 more resolution sessions to be resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

Indicator 16

Indicator 16, Mediation Agreements, measures the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediated agreements. During the 19-20 school year Ohio was at 80%. Each year we have met or exceeded our mediation targets over the last 5 years. Reviewing the proposed targets for indicator 16. The goal for indicator 16 is to be at or above the target or to fall within the target range. Target option A, ending in a range of 84-88% during the 2025-26 school year, allows Ohio to stay at a range which gives us a cushion in case of a drop given the reality of mediation. In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target range of 84.00%-88.00% will require 4 more mediations to result in mediation agreements. Target option B has more rigorous ranges starting at higher ranges of 80%-87%, to maintain the 2019-20 levels of performances. In comparison to Ohio's 2019-20 performance, meeting the final target range of 85.00%-91.00% will require 5 more mediations to result in mediation agreements.

Closing Remarks & Meeting Adjourn

Kara Waldron concluded her indicator discussion and thanked SAPEC members for their feedback and engagement throughout the day. Kara reminded members that additional feedback can be provided through public comment throughout the month of October.

Monica Drvota concluded the meeting by also thanking members for attending and engaging in the indicator process. A reminder was given to complete the meeting feedback survey through SurveyMonkey. Our next meeting will be November 4th.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned.