

**Washington State Special Education Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes for May 13-14, 2010
DSHS Region 2 Office, Suite 302; Yakima, WA**

May 13, 2010

Members Present:

Trip Goodall, *Chair*; Mary Alice Heuschel, *Vice Chair*; Ann Waybright, *Executive Committee*; LouOma Durand; Cheryl Fernandez; Anne Golden; Heather Hebdon; Jeanmarie Moore; Nancy Pack; and Amy Patterson

Excused Absences:

Steven Nourse; Ron Seifert; and Anne Shureen Smith

OSPI Staff:

Doug Gill; Bob Harmon

Note Taker:

Alisa Conway

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Day 1: Call to Order – Trip Goodall	<p>Trip called the meeting to order at 9:09 and took roll call. Trip covered the meeting protocol and the agenda.</p> <p>Minutes of the March 18, 2010 meeting were approved with 1 minor edit.</p>	The minutes are to be corrected and resent to the committee.	Alisa / Michelle	
Alternate Assessment Update and Discussion – Mike Middleton	<p>Mike presented updates on Alternate Assessment. He also included feedback on the process and tool used in administration of the Portfolio.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoring completed this Monday. • The ProFile assessment tool worked well in identifying extensions. • High school testing went well. • Test is now shorter and takes less time to complete; however, feedback reports a need for additional reading time. • Projected 20,000 students would take the general assessment online, but currently have 50,000 students. • Paper and pencil test started May 12, 2010, and will go until the 28th of May. 			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>In December of 2009, a workgroup of representatives addressed concerns about the existing Alternate Assessment Program. Possible avenues to pursue testing options are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide a better definition of students who need to complete a WAAS Portfolio. (Note: This task has been completed.) • Create depth to address the variety of different cognitive capacities. <p>In building their portfolios, Assessment is constructing extensions with images (two similar answers and one distracter).</p> <p>The extensions are not changing, new ones are being added. There will be a feedback process of grade level expectations (GLEs) that are being used, and those that are not.</p> <p>Discussion ensued. SEAC members expressed concern that there are areas of assessment requiring more review such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the IEP be driving factor? • How to derive and define relevance of standards? • How to best collect data? • How to ensure the IEP is connected to measurement of knowledge and skills? • Is assessment driving curriculum and instruction? • How to incorporate the online tools and connect it to the IEP? • Should we teach to the test or teach to the strategies of the testing? • How do we limit extensions? <p>Discussion continued regarding whether the IEP should be the driver in measuring students' progress. A recommendation was made for an IEP to be designed so that the work can directly reflect progress and can be measured accurately.</p> <p>Trip indicated general education developed a collection of evidence (COE) to demonstrate proficiency, and asked why we didn't have a COE model for significantly cognitively impaired students, and SEAC expected these issues to be addressed.</p> <p>Bob Harmon stated that OSPI, under the previous Administration, drafted an RFP for a developmentally appropriate WASL. The Legislature did not fund it at that time. Since the</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>change in administration at the federal level, it might be worth our time to make that argument again.</p> <p>SEAC members endorsed and strongly encouraged OSPI to proceed with an approach to the Portfolio that begins with an IEP goal for significantly cognitively challenged students as opposed to beginning with an Essential Learning Requirement. Members indicated that such a conceptual shift could continue to meet the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements, but would be more mindful of relevant student progress.</p>			
Legislative Update – Doug	<p>The State budget was the first topic of the legislative update. The special education section is 507. Section 209 restores Medicaid for special education eligible students. Page 191 is the demonstration of projects for response to intervention (RTI). If a district is able to provide RTI services and reduce the population, this money will compensate those districts for the differences between where they were and where they are. The concept is to have no financial penalty for reducing the district’s special education population as a result of improved instruction for all students.</p> <p>In section 507, (5b), the basic education allocation now includes classified staff enhancement. Safety Net allocation reductions reflect the impact of the ARRA funding. Until all ARRA monies have been spent (by September 2011), OSPI cannot determine the impact ARRA will have on safety net.</p> <p>State budget cuts for OSPI and Special Education were addressed. With the possibility of furlough days, Doug informed the group that Special Education has reorganized the work into the following three categories: 1) Must Do; 2) Need To Do; and 3) Nice To Do. Doug’s main concern is not being able to provide services that are necessary for students in a timely manner.</p>			
Director’s Report (Working Lunch) – Doug	<p>Doug asked the group to review the proposed IEP team guidelines for Assessment and requested comments so that the guide can be revised as needed. Clarification was requested on the membership of the IEP team. Doug responded that the IEP team for each student eligible for special education includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parents of the student; • Not less than one general education teacher of the student if the student is, or may be, participating in the general education environment; • Not less than one special education teacher of the student, or where appropriate, not 	Review IEP Guide for edits and comments.	Group – by 5/14 mtg.	

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>less than one special education provider of the student;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A representative of the public agency who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students eligible for special education; ○ Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum; and ○ Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the school district. • An individual who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results, who may be a member of the team described in (b) through (e) of this subsection; • At the discretion of the parent or the school district, other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student, including related services personnel as appropriate; and • Whenever appropriate, the student. <p>Doug developed a diagram for assessments showing state assessment, alternate assessment and graduation requirements. Separating the graduation requirements from the discussion of statewide assessment seemed helpful. Heather agreed that these need to be separate, and when IEP teams merge these two, it becomes an issue.</p>			
<p>Annual Dispute Resolution Summary – Pam McPartland and Kristin Hennessey</p>	<p>Pam McPartland provided a summary of issues regarding dispute resolution. Pam provided the members with summaries of citizen complaints and due process hearing decisions for 2009. In addition, she provided weblink information for accessing the summaries and decisions. She shared with members that issue trends include progress monitoring towards annual goals, parent participation, prior written notice and transfer procedures.</p> <p>Kristin shared her observations of trends based on the calls she receives. Kristin also introduced SEAC members to information she posted in late fall for families on OSPI’s Web site about special education services (“<i>Guidance for Families about Special Education Services</i>”). Many families lack a basic understanding of special education processes and topics. It is critical that parents have access to information that helps them to better understand and participate in their child’s special education program.</p>			
<p>Review SEAC’s 2009–2010 Agenda; Develop</p>	<p>Anne Smith visited the State Advisory Panel (SAP) website and participated in the webinar on May 3, 2010. She gave a brief report of the information presented during the webinar. SEAC’s Emerging Issues are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESEA Reauthorization • Quality Education Council 			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
SEAC's 2009–2010 Annual Report – Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDEA Reauthorization • Birth to 3 • Discipline (seclusion and restraints) • WAAS/DAMSP/Portfolio (IEP Driven Assessment) • Funding • Funding for Transition Age Services • Innovation in Special Education • PBS - RTI - Behavioral Data Collection • SPDG • Mental Health Issues – School-based services • An increase in intra/inter-agency communication • Parent Education re: Special Education and Resources Advocacy/Leadership • Growth Model Assessment • Increase SEAC's sphere of influence. • Doug encourages the group to use caution and make sure that they are advocating as opposed to lobbying. • National Learning Standards - regarding Special education • University/Business/Organization - partnerships <p>Doug stated that this group continues to influence change at OSPI. It is SEAC's responsibility to make recommendations on policy.</p>	<p>Spring of 2011 – Recommendation regarding WAAS / DAMSP/Portfolio (IEP Driven Assessment)</p>		
Executive Committee Nomination and Elections – Group	<p>Ann Waybright explained the role and the responsibilities of Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Executive Chairperson.</p> <p>Mary Alice agreed and encouraged those who may be interested to give their information.</p> <p>5/14 Nominations for the 2010–2011 SEAC Executive Committee: Trip was nominated for Chairperson, Anne Golden was nominated for Vice Chairperson, Executive Member Nancy Pack.</p> <p>Motion passed.</p>			
Public Comment	<p>No comments were submitted.</p>			
Adjourned	<p>Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.</p>			

**Washington State Special Education Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes for May 13-14, 2010
DSHS Region 2 Office, Suite 302; Yakima, WA**

May 14, 2010

Members Present:

Trip Goodall, *Chair*; Ann Waybright, *Executive Committee*; LouOma Durand; Anne Golden; Heather Hebdon; Jeanmarie Moore; Nancy Pack; Amy Patterson; and Anne Shureen Smith

Excused Absences:

Mary Alice Heuschel *Vice Chair*; Steven Nourse; Ron Seifert;

OSPI Staff:

Doug Gill; Bob Harmon

Note Taker:

Alisa Conway

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Day 2: Call to Order – Trip Goodall	Trip called the meeting to order at 8:37. Trip reviewed the days activities			
Teletherapy Overview/Update – Cherie Patterson; SPDG Update/Discussion – Leslie Pyper	<p>Leslie began by providing an update on the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 30th turned in Annual Report to OSEP. • Hired Rebecca Zumeta (working 10 hrs per week right now). • Restructured State Leadership Team (advisory group) • OSPI Implementation Team • As we provide trainings OSPI will be using the RTI Framework, Strategic Planning • Race To The Top Participation • PBIS/RTI • Formative Assessment System <p>As a direct result of this work, we are now able to apply for the National RTI grant.</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Leslie is going to present in Washington, D.C. about gaining support for RTI at the state level. Leslie opened the floor for questions, and discussion ensued.</p> <p>Cherie Patterson then updated SEAC on the progress of the teletherapy pilot project. Teletherapy may be more affordable, because districts may be currently paying travel costs that would not apply in teletherapy.</p> <p>Cherie indicated the issue of teletherapy has some potential for Washington, especially in rural and remote sites. She invited questions and some discussion ensued.</p>			
<p>Intra-Agency Communications – Alan Burke</p>	<p>Alan Burke was introduced to SEAC. He was reminded that SEAC advises OSPI about the unmet needs of students. The statewide assessment program was a major topic of discussion. Although Mike Middleton had explained the Assessment Department’s point of view on Thursday, there still appears to be an obvious disconnection to how the agency approaches kids that are significantly cognitively challenged.</p> <p>Trip indicated that SEAC always advocated that the IEP is the contract between a school and a family with objectives and goals that have been agreed upon. And then we get No Child Left Behind (NCLB) asking which is more important, the IEP or the assessment?</p> <p>Alan responded the fear is the current law, ESEA, restricts flexibility with regard to student assessment to a large extent and particularly for students with disabilities. He indicated that in his mind, the IEP should drive the whole thing. He assured SEAC that OSPI will try hard to make sure that people like Senator Patty Murray are aware of this dilemma. The previous day’s diagram was presented and Alan stated that most people lobbying for ESEA reauthorization agree that Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR) is the driver. Alan indicated that attempts are being made to improve agency communications, both internal and external.</p> <p>Amy noted that from an ESEA standpoint, most advocates are focusing on the EALRs approach and she’s not hearing much about the IEP driven approach. She stated that we needed to have ways of assessing what our significantly cognitively challenged students are capable of doing, and that a lot of the stuff on the ESEA side was not of much value for these students.</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Heather commented that she didn't see the issue as an "either-or", and there needs to be a braiding of these topics in a more thoughtful way. She indicated that people need to stop looking at the standard driving the process, and should look at the student driving the process.</p> <p>Trip asked if the agency had an option of being proactive instead of reactive on this topic. He also said that issues of communication from Assessment appear as though Special Education staff have not been involved in discussions or decisions. Alan said he is aware of the disconnection, and sees that we are moving in the right direction.</p> <p>SEAC thanked Alan for his willingness to attend the meeting and have a frank conversation related to their issues of concern.</p>			
<p>Continuation of SEAC's 2010-2011 Agenda Development – Group (working lunch)</p>	<p>Yesterday's emerging issues were recapped and rated by importance to SEAC. Below are the top three:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding • Compliance • Assessments <p>Discussions ensued.</p>			
<p>Overview of the Agency's Work on ESEA Reauthorization – Bob Harmon</p>	<p>Bob Harmon began by updating SEAC on the status of the ESEA Reauthorization.</p> <p>Chairman George Miller (D-CA) of the House Education and Labor Committee supports the reauthorization. The committee has completed the previous discussion draft and announced in February 2010 that they intend to have H.R. 4330, titled "All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2009", through the House by late spring 2010.</p> <p>Chairman Tom Harkin (D-IA) of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (H.E.L.P.) committee also supports the reauthorization. During the spring 2010 session, Hearings included topics such as Standards and Assessments, School Turnaround, Early Childhood, and Career and College Ready.</p> <p>ESEA actions are parallel as both the House and Senate are holding meetings on ESEA. The Education Department also released their "blueprint".</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Bob highlighted the following recommendations OSPI has for the ESEA reauthorization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Implement college- and career-ready standards and high quality, valid, and reliable assessments for all children. II. Increase teacher and leader effectiveness and ensure equitable distribution of qualified personnel. III. Turnaround the lowest performing schools. IV. Develop and use pre-K-through-post secondary-and-career data systems. V. Provide adequate resources and funding. <p>Bob continued on to explain how those recommendations should be implemented.</p>			
Evaluation of Meeting – Group	Meeting debrief, evaluation and discussion ensued. General consensus was that the agenda topics for discussion were presented in a way that was beneficial to the group and the discussions and actions to follow will eventually lead to improvements in the system.			
Announcements				
Correspondence				
Adjourned	Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.			