

Washington State Special Education Advisory Council

June 9, 2011

Members Present: Doug Gill, Samuel “Trip” Goodall, Heather Hebdon, Mary Alice Heuschel, Steve Nourse, Nancy Pack, Amy Patterson, Ronald Seifert, Ann Waybright

Excused Absences: Lou Oma Durand, Cheryl Fernandez, Anne Golden, Jeanmarie Moore, Anne Shureen Smith

OSPI Staff: Robin Munson

Note Taker: Kim Bahrenburg, OSPI

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Called to Order	Trip Goodall, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:32 am.			
Approval of February Minutes	Minutes were approved with the correction of one spelling error on page 2. Heather Hebdon – First Motion Ann Waybright – Second Motion	Kim will fix spelling error and then post to website.	Kim	Yes
Legislative Updates	<p>State Budget Update</p> <p>The 2011 Legislature adjourned on May 25. The final operating budget adopted by the Legislature includes cuts to K-12 education of approximately \$1.8 billion for the biennium. These cuts include suspension of I-728 and I-732 (\$1.2 billion); elimination of K-4 class size enhancements (\$215 million); salary reductions (\$179 million, 1.9% for classified and certificated staff and 3% for administrative staff); changes to national board bonuses (\$61 million); changes to student assessment moving to one math assessment for the classes of 2013 and 2014, and changing the science requirement to the class of 2015 (\$57</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>million); changes to alternative education programs (\$41 million); eliminating Materials, Supplies, and Operating Costs (MSOC) funds related to K-4 (\$24 million); food service (\$6 million); and changes to Running Start enrollment from 2.0 FTE to 1.2 FTE (\$6 million).</p> <p>There were some budget add-ins which included \$33.6 million for k-3 class size reductions in high poverty schools; \$25 million to implement a new BEA funding formula based on a prototypical school model; \$5 million towards a new transportation allocation; \$5 million for all-day kindergarten in high poverty schools; \$4 million in match monies for a public/private partnership with Microsoft (IT Academy); \$3 million in dropout prevention; and \$3 million for the teacher/principal evaluation program. Local Effort Assistance was not cut.</p> <p>From a special education standpoint, safety net funding will become an annual application process with funds to be awarded in August of each year, and school based Medicaid for eligible students will be available through intergovernmental transfers (this process is not yet fully developed at this time).</p>			
Year End Review	<p>Funding: We did not have a direct impact but we did have numerous discussions about this subject, including various budget proposals.</p> <p>Assessment: We did have an impact on the alternate assessment process! We are hopeful that this will be a good shift. Reminder to all that kids are general education kids first.</p> <p>Least Restrictive Placement: We have not had the opportunity to deal with this issue. This will be something that we will continue</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>to work with because of funding and assessment. We have discussed that districts have been known to incorrectly identify LRE on their counts. OSPI has come up with a new calculator and template for both 619 and 611 age students that should help districts. The calculations should not be based on the minutes in the IEP but rather on the actual time spent in general education settings. Least Restrictive Environment does not mean Least Restrictive Placement.</p> <p>Family Engagement: We do have these discussions on a regular basis. It is part of our responsibility to keep this at the forefront of our discussions. Having parent involvement is so important. Getting buy-in from families from the beginning is the key to getting programs to work. Sound Options is really helping with the IEP facilitation and it makes families feel safe when they have an option such as this.</p> <p>Pre-service Training: Ensuring that there is fidelity in pre-service training and getting teachers really ready for teaching special education is a priority for SEAC. Some of the examples of getting teachers ready for special education are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All teachers need to be comfortable working with children with disabilities. • Teachers need to be trained on how to direct their Para-pros and how to use them correctly and efficiently. • Hands on experience by using the “Round Robin” approach for student 			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>teachers, so that they can experience all types of education and teaching (including an inclusive environment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A co-teaching model might be a good model for SEAC to recommend for pre-service training of student teachers. <p>Our recommendations for next year are as follows:</p> <p>Recommendation 1:</p> <p>SEAC continues to support legislative efforts to fund the prototypical school model that will fund the actual cost of educating all students.</p> <p>Our recommendation is consistent with previous SEAC recommendations regarding funding for education in general and special education specifically. We recognize that the cost of educating students with disabilities is a concern on which the legislature continues to seek guidance. Students with special education needs should not be the scapegoats for what may be inadequate funding of basic education services. When basic education funding is appropriate, the special education funding for those excess costs will more readily be met because special education funding is a derivative of basic education funding. SEAC recommends that the Legislature determine the actual cost of educating all students in Washington State. When the actual costs are identified for this “paramount duty” of the State Constitution, then the percentage of excess costs associated with special education can be applied and funding to</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>address any necessary increases will be built on a solid foundation.</p> <p>Recommendation 2:</p> <p>SEAC continues to support the development and funding of a uniform statewide student data system that tracks student data and achievements.</p> <p>A longitudinal student data system would provide relevant information that can be used to document the results of scientifically based strategies. RTI data collection is an example of a component of a longitudinal data base. Such a data base would increase the availability of information on “best practices”. Such a system would also provide a method of capturing trend data and help ensure that this information drives changes and improvements for all students. Implementing the data system would ease transitions from early learning to the K-12 school years and beyond. At present, the system is too fragmented, too difficult to access, and too cumbersome to navigate. A well-designed system will allow for more appropriate use of data to better inform policy and decision-making. Progress needs to continue in this area.</p> <p>Recommendation 3:</p> <p>Continue to seek ways to develop stronger intra-agency communication with regard to all issues pertaining to special education.</p> <p>Valuable perspectives and expertise exist within OSPI on matters pertaining to special education. SEAC recognizes that compliance issues tied to ESEA and funding are complex.</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>It is vitally important that discussions leading to decisions impacting special education students, families, and services continue to be shared with key special education staff. For example, the school improvement process as directed by OSPI needs to be better coordinated. Agency endeavors, initiatives, and programs impacting special education require a conversation with the special education department. The collaborative approach utilized with respect to Alternate Assessment provides a model for how we need to approach complex issues in order to develop sound solutions benefitting those we serve.</p> <p>Recommendation 4:</p> <p>SEAC recommends a review of special education pre-service requirements.</p> <p>SEAC recommends an examination of current pre-service training to determine how teacher candidates are introduced to issues involving special education. Teacher candidates need to understand concepts such as RTI, supervision of Para educators, and modification and accommodation strategies. SEAC sees value in the co-teaching model as one way to allow teacher candidates to work closely with accomplished teachers who understand assessment, intervention, and instructional strategies that meet the needs of special education students. At a minimum, every teacher candidate should have some formal time working with special education students.</p>			
2011 Annual Report	Trip will be providing Mr. Dorn with our 2010-2011 Annual Report by July 1, 2011.			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
LUNCH	Membership update: Jeanmarie Moore and Ron Seifert will not be continuing their participation on SEAC. A framed certificate was presented to Ron Seifert for his outstanding commitment to SEAC. Jeanmarie's certificate will be sent to her via the mail because she was unable to attend this meeting.	An announcement and application will be posted on our OSPI/Special Education website for people to apply for our current open positions.	Kim	Yes
Director's Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESHB 1519 did pass. This is regarding the portfolio assessment and that there needs to be continued work on the portfolio process. • Local fund applications have been changed. 265 and 267 have been merged into one application. Applications received by July 1, will have a spending start date of July 1. Applications received after this date, will have a spending start date of September 1. Districts need to be more vigilant on updating their contract contact information. • The Safety Net process will be going to a 1 time per year system. This was changed due to the new legislative requirements. • OSEP and OIG have completed their auditing visits of the Special Education section at OSPI. Results will be shared when they become available. • IDEA and ARRA grant balances show that money has not been spent for many districts. At the end of May, over 40% of the districts have not drawn down their money! 			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A risk management assessment tool has been developed and posted to the OSPI website. This tool will allow districts to see where possible audit findings could be in their districts. • Data Requirements are due to OSPI by July 15th. • Special Education has posted “Tips from Special Education” as part of the Monthly Updates that seem to have useful to districts. • The State Needs projects have been evaluated and there have been a few changes to them. A complete list is on our OSPI website. • Technology in Special Education such as ipads is becoming a route of how many services are being delivered in our schools. 			
Program of Work for 2011-2012	<p>SEAC would like to initiate and research further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology and Special Education. • Affective use of Para-pros and how they are assigned. Also the training of Para-pros (i.e. what are the contractual obligations by districts)? • RTI and the RTI Technical Assistance Center. Where are we philosophically as a council on RTI? Do we want to look at doing a position paper focusing on RTI? • We would also like to focus on “Building Partnerships”. 			
Alternate Assessment	<p>Robin Munson was our guest speaker today. She presented to SEAC the work that she has been doing on the Alternate Assessment and</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	where we are today. Substantial progress has been made since June of 2010, and changes to the current process were outline together with an implementation timeline for 2012 testing. Handouts were provided outlining the proposed changes and tentative timelines for implementation.			
Public Comment	None			
Adjourned	4:30			