

**SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**Corrected Minutes – January 11, 2013**  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Brendelyn Ancheta, Jyo Bridgewater, Bob Campbell, Debbie Cheeseman, Annette Cooper, Phyllis DeKok, Martha Guinan, Tami Ho, Peter Kawamura (for Shari Dela Cuadra-Larsen), Rachel Matsunobu, Dale Matsuura, Zaidarene Place, Barbara Pretty, Susan Rocco, Melissa Rosen, Tricia Sheehey, Ivalee Sinclair, Tom Smith, Mike Tamahaha, Jan Tateishi, Cari White  
**EXCUSED:** Gabriele Finn, Barbara Ioli, Deborah Kobayakawa, Bernadette Lane, Eleanor MacDonald, Stacey Oshio, Kauai Rezentes

**ABSENT:** Shanelle Lum, Dan Ulrich

**GUESTS:** Brian De Lima, Pat Park, Steven Vannatta

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>Call to Order</b>	Ivalee Sinclair called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.	
<b>Announcements</b>	1 - Martha Guinan announced that the written due process report covering SY 10-11 is now available to members and posted on the website. A formal copy was sent to Superintendent Matayoshi and Deputy Superintendent Ronn Nozoe. 2 – Tom Smith announced a website called Fight Fraud First (www.americansagainstfraud.org/) encouraging voters contact Congress and ask that Medicaid fraud be addressed before cutting services to seniors and persons with disabilities. 3 – Jan Tateishi announced that SPIN will cover the airfare and registration for any member wishing to attend the SPIN Conference.	Copies of the 2012 Due Process Report were distributed.  Copies of the SPIN Conference booklet were placed in members' folders.
<b>SEAC Display Table</b>	Jan and Ivalee encouraged members to consider manning a SEAC table again at the April 6 <sup>th</sup> SPIN Conference. Ivalee, Tom, Brende Ancheta, Barbara Pretty and Phyllis DeKok volunteered to assist.	Jan will ask Barbara Ioli if she is willing to organize volunteers for the table.
<b>New Member Welcome</b>	Ivalee welcomed Bob Campbell as the appointed member representing the needs of military students with disabilities and their families.	
<b>Review of October 12, November 9 and December 14, 2012 minutes</b>	Due to a lack of quorum at the November and December meetings, members reviewed minutes for the past three meetings. The only correction was to the date of the meeting on the first page of the December minutes.	10/12/12 and 11/9/12 minutes were approved as circulated. 12/14/12 minutes were approved as corrected.
<b>Report from the Special Projects Office</b>	Peter Kawamura reported on the following items for Shari Dela Cuadra-Larsen: <u>Response to SEAC's 6/20/12 Letter to the Superintendent re: ESY Chapter 60 guidelines</u> have finally been approved and will soon be available to the field. If there are still issues regarding the determination	

<p><b>Report from the Special Projects Office (cont.)</b></p>	<p><u>Response to SEAC’s 6/20/12 Letter to the Superintendent re: ESY (cont.)</u>  of ESY services for students with disabilities once the guidelines are disseminated, SEAC can send a letter to the Superintendent outlining our concerns.</p> <p><u>Public access to Chapter 60 Guidelines</u>  Shari Dela Cuadra-Larsen met with Ronn Nozoe regarding the Chapter 60 guidelines, and DOE leadership has decided that the guidelines will remain an internal document. The Department will work with SEAC on creating a family-friendly version of the guidelines.</p> <p><u>Chapter 60 Training</u>  The Department will share its plans for Chapter 60 training with SEAC, although there are no specific dates as yet. The training plan will be similar to the training around Chapter 56.</p> <p><u>Chapter 19 Guidelines</u>  As with Chapter 60, DOE has decided to keep the guidelines an internal document, but will work with stakeholders on a parent friendly version.</p> <p><u>Chapter 60 Draft Revisions</u>  Peter did not have information on the status of the revisions to Chapter 60 to incorporate private school monitoring. Brian De Lima clarified that the Board of Education sent the revisions back to the Attorney General’s Office for corrections, and they haven’t come back as yet.</p> <p><u>Questions/comments from members:</u>  C. Since SEAC originally worked on the first round of guidelines in 2008 we have been told that the guidelines would be shared with the public, and that SEAC would be involved in training efforts. The point of inclusive training is that everyone gets the same information at the same time.  C. SEAC also received a presentation by Jean Nakasato on the Chapter 19 rules several years ago and were told that when the guidelines were available, we would have access to them.  C. SPIN and SEAC have been waiting for a copy of the final Chapter 60 guidelines to update “A Parent’s Guide to Partnership in Special Education.” A number of schools and parents have asked for copies when they are available.</p>	<p>Peter and Brian will check on the status of the Chapter 60 revisions.</p>
---	---	--

<p><b>Review of DOE Strategic Plan – Goal 1</b></p>	<p>Members reviewed the objectives, targets and strategies under Goal 1 – Student Success. Ivalee reviewed SEAC’s involvement with the SCR 79 Work Group, and its recommendations regarding measuring family-school partnerships, home-school communication and student safety. At the Board of Education’s Student Achievement Committee meeting on January 8<sup>th</sup>, SEAC submitted testimony recommending that Hawaii’s Youth Risk Behavior Survey be added as a measurement of student safety; however, the Department wants to hold off on adding the survey results at this time. Pat Park shared that it might be difficult to capture data on family-school partnership activities for 252 schools.</p> <p><u>Questions/comments from members and guests</u></p> <p>C. The SCR 79 Work Group offered guidelines (like the National PTA Family School Partnership Assessment) and examples that individual schools could use to measure progress.</p> <p>C. Members from SEAC also created a document outlining what Universal Design for Family School Partnership might look like.</p> <p>C. As a member of the Board, I am very excited about the Strategic Plan because it puts more flesh on the bone and offers a balanced scorecard.</p> <p>C. Now that I am a resource care provider (formerly called foster parent) for my hanai grand daughter, I’m concerned that RCPs are typically not included in educational decision making. A. (Ivalee) We can go back to ensure that the RCP is included under the broad definition of family in the proposed Board Policy on Family School Partnerships.</p>	<p>Susan will send members a link to the handouts on metrics for Goal 1 shared at the 1/8/13 SAC meeting.</p> <p>Members who would like to work with a small SEAC subgroup on Goal 1 are asked to contact Ivalee.</p>
<p><b>Report from OCISS/OCCR</b></p>	<p>Pat Park, Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support (soon to be renamed the Office of College and Career Readiness) reported on the following:</p> <p><u>OCISS Reorganization</u></p> <p>A survey and study on functions and job descriptions for employees at OCISS is currently underway and will be completed by the end of March.</p> <p><u>WestEd Update</u></p> <p>WestEd consultants submitted their final report to DOE leadership and will be meeting in person the end of January. Virginia Reynolds will be making a presentation at the Community Children’s Council Co-Chair</p>	

<p><b>Report from OCISS/OCCR</b></p>	<p><u>WestEd Update (cont.)</u>          meeting on January 26<sup>th</sup>.  <u>Questions/comments from members:</u>          Q. Is it possible to have WestEd make a presentation to SEAC, as well?          A. I'm don't know the history of how that is set up, so I suggest you contact them directly.</p>	<p>Ivalee will follow-up with WestEd.</p>
<p>SPP/APR Feedback</p>	<p>Ivalee acknowledged that Debbie Farmer sent out the evaluation from the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. It reflected 27 responders, most with favorable comments. Members gave the following comments about the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I got insight into the other indicators, but I wish there was more time for discussion.</li> <li>• I felt rushed in each section; it was confusing and very hurried.</li> <li>• There was no wrap-up at the end.</li> <li>• I liked the format and all the indicators; however, I felt we could have used the time spent on the morning discussion with Cezar in group discussions.</li> <li>• I thought having to repeat the presentation helped the group leaders, but it didn't give us time to understand and comment.</li> <li>• My group started out with 6-8 folks but by the end of the day, only 3 survived.</li> <li>• I would like to see more intentional linking of the data report and the activities for the follow-up year.</li> <li>• I would appreciate a more deliberate structure to the group; there should be different stakeholders in each group.</li> <li>• New participants need more of an orientation, and there needs to be more use of SMART goals.</li> <li>• SEAC can help the process if we use a meeting prior to the APR to plan (i.e. October).</li> <li>• The parent survey for indicator 8 has a low participation rate and is problematic. Can DOE determine a return rate by school?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Legislative Committee Report</b></p>	<p>Ivalee reported on pieces of legislation SEAC is watching including :          ✓ an autism insurance parity bill;</p>	<p>Members who wish to join the Legislative Committee</p>

<p><b>Legislative Committee Report (cont)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>√ a continuation of SCR 79 on family school partnerships;</li> <li>√ early childhood legislation to create more preschool slots;</li> <li>√ DOE’s budget that adds 4 positions for the Special Projects Office and shifts contract monies to paid EA autism positions; and</li> <li>√ a bill modeled on the Family-School Partnership Act in California;</li> </ul> <p><u>Dyslexia legislation</u>        Jyo Bridgewater and Tricia Sheehey, members of the Dyslexia Working Group, shared information on their 70-page aspirational plan to increase awareness of dyslexia, and provide personnel development on a multi-sensory approach to reading and literacy specialists at each school. Tricia added that a big focus of the plan is on Level 1 and Level 2 prevention by training teachers through pre-service and in-service to recognize literacy challenges of their students and employ effective strategies. There is draft legislation, but Jyo and Tricia are not sure it is ready for distribution as yet. Pat added that the \$14.5 million needed to add a literacy teacher at each school is an issue with the Department. Susan suggested that existing positions might be converted into literacy specialists. Ivalee suggested that the plan interface with Response to Intervention training recently undertaken by the Department.</p> <p><u>WSF and Staffing</u>        Ivalee reported that the Weighted Student Formula attempts to make resources more equitable, but that small schools are at a disadvantage due to staffing issues. Susan mentioned that WestEd convened two meetings of stakeholders last year to consider adjusting the special education staffing allocation method. Dale Matsuura added that staffing is a part of contract negotiations, so the only way to change staffing is through the contract. Pat clarified that staffing is currently based on percentages.</p> <p><u>Military autism services</u>        Tom reported that the National Defense Authorization Act signed December 3, 2012 lifts the cap on autism services for military dependents and expands eligibility to children of veterans.</p>	<p>were asked to contact Ivalee.</p> <p>Jyo encouraged members who want more information about the plan or legislation to email her.</p>
---	--	--