

**SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**Minutes – March 9, 2018**

9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Brendelyn Ancheta, Debbie Cheeseman, Annette Cooper, Sage Goto, Martha Guinan, Scott Hashimoto (for Kurt Humphrey), Amanda Kaahanui (staff), Pina Lemusu, Dale Matsuura, Kaili Murbach, Carrie Pisciotto, Susan Rocco (staff), Rosie Rowe, Tricia Sheehey, Ivalee Sinclair, James Street, Todd Takahashi, Christina Tydeman, Steven Vannatta, Lisa Vegas (for Stacey Oshio), Amy Wiech, Jasmine Williams, Susan Wood

**EXCUSED:** Gabriele Finn, Bernadette Lane, Kauai Rezentes, Daniel Santos, Gavin Villar

**ABSENT:** Bob Campbell, Cathy Kahooahanohano

**GUESTS:** Joanne Cashman, Cesar D’Agord, Linda Elento, Lori Lee Goeas, Dayna Hironaka, Dessi Kirova

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>Call to Order</b>	Chair Martha Guinan called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m.	
<b>Introductions</b>	Members and guests introduced themselves to Joanne Cashman and Cesar D’Agord of the National Center for Systemic Improvement.	
<b>Announcements</b>	Amanda Kaahau oriented members to the new meeting room and encouraged members to consider nominating a parent or professional for an award for service to children with disabilities and their families to be announced at the April 21 <sup>st</sup> SPIN Conference.	
<b>Review of Minutes for February 9, 2018</b>	Susan Wood made two corrections: 1) on page 5, <b>Superintendent’s Task Force Member Report</b> the last comment should read “the Office of Community Engagement focuses more on community relationships and not on connecting with parents;” and 2) on page 7, <b>Discussion of Legislative Priorities (Including ABA in School Settings)</b> , the second to the last sentence should say “RBT” rather than “RPT.” Amy Wiech submitted one written correction to her comment on page 6 (same header as #2 above): the first sentence in the third bullet should read “I have trained RBTs in 3 days, 5 hours a day, with an additional 27.5 hours online.”	The minutes were approved as corrected.
<b>Leading by Convening: The Human Side of Practice Change</b>	Steven Vannatta introduced Joanne Cashman from the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) and the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). He and Susan Wood first met Ms. Cashman in 2005 when she was working with Hawaii on developing Communities of Practice (COP) around school based mental health. Joanne explained that the COP process was not just for folks who are formal leaders. Rather, everyone is a leader and everyone is a learner. Stakeholders are individuals who are impacted by an organization’s	

<p><b>Leading by Convening: The Human Side of Practice Change (cont.)</b></p>	<p>beliefs, goals, actions and policies. COPs are more sustainable because the members believe in the mission. Leading by Convening, as developed by the IDEA Partnership, was a result of learning together by bringing people together.</p> <p><u>Describing Collaboration exercise</u></p> <p>To illustrate that the term “collaboration” can mean different things to different people, Joanne showed 8 images representing collaboration and asked members which image resonated with them and why. Descriptors of favorite depictions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each one has responsibility, but it doesn’t work until they come together;</li> <li>• They’re going in the same direction;</li> <li>• Everyone is supporting each other for the same action;</li> <li>• The arrows represent the people I would be working with—we need each other to decide how we want to go;</li> <li>• Everyone’s role is as important as the other; if something doesn’t work, it’s not one person’s fault—it’s everyone’s fault.</li> <li>• We need each other; and</li> <li>• Without people, nothing happens.</li> </ul> <p>Negative associations included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The arrows only went one way;</li> <li>• The groups are not interacting with each other;</li> <li>• It reminds me of a train-the-trainers model; and</li> <li>• The term “collaboration” is not family-friendly. It reminds me of “collaborating with the enemy.” Parents tend to use the term partners or partnerships.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounding Assumptions on Stakeholder Engagement</u></p> <p>Joanne shared a grid showing progressive beliefs or assumptions as stakeholder relationships and commitments deepen. Having broad base support for risk-taking is a big piece of making change. She acknowledged SEAC’s commitment to going forward with stakeholders the Department of Education as allies in change.</p>	<p>Joanne will provide copies of her powerpoint and the Leading by Convening workbook, including a thumb drive containing the book’s contents.</p>
---	---	--

SEAC Minutes

March 9, 2018

Page 3

<p><b>Leading by Convening: The Human Side of Practice Change (cont.)</b></p>	<p><u>Resetting the Relationship</u> Joanne shared that “reset” is the latest buzzword for systems change. To reset means to try to create something new while acknowledging that systems can’t abdicate their responsibilities and stakeholders can’t give up on their passions. Everyone becomes a learner and a leader, although it’s hard for people in power to admit that they are learners because they are expected to “know.” Conversely, some stakeholders find it hard to take on a leadership role. Joanne shared a handout entitled “Are you managing or engaging your stakeholders?” and asked SEAC members to think about SEAC’s current relationship with state leadership compared to recent years.</p>	<p>Christina will develop an anonymous Survey Monkey question to poll members on their current rating of the state/stakeholder relationship.</p>
<p><b>Significant Disproportionality Thresholds</b></p>	<p>Christina Tydeman began the discussion regarding setting significant disproportionality (SD) thresholds through a discussion of current data and examining the effect of applying various cell sizes and n-sizes. She provided a quick review of the findings of the Government Accounting Office (GAO) report in 2013 that lead the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) to develop a standard approach for defining SD for use by all states. Christina also announced the U.S. DOE is proposing to postpone compliance with the new SD regulations by two years—from July 2018 to July 2020. Hawaii plans to proceed despite the feds proposal to push back the deadline. In the case of SD, Hawaii needs to review and revise policies, procedures and practices. Calculations for SD must include 1) identifying students with disabilities (six eligibility categories + all students), 2) placement (less than 40% in regular class and separate school or residential placement), and 3) discipline (including out-of-school and in-school suspensions).</p> <p><u>Data discussion</u> Cesar D’Agord joined Christina to explain two data tables—Hawaii’s student population by race/ethnicity and a breakdown of the federal Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander category into distinct categories (Native Hawaiian, Samoan, Micronesian, Tongan, Other Pacific Islander, Guamanian, and two or more). The data indicate that Native Hawaiian students make up the highest number of students and are at a higher risk of</p>	<p>SEAC will consider providing comments to the U.S. DOE proposal to delay implementation of the SD regulations by the deadline in mid May.</p>

<p><b>Significant Disproportionality Thresholds (cont.)</b></p>	<p>SD. There is also possible risk to students of American Indian or Alaskan Native heritage but the group is comprised of only 77 special education students. In setting a vision, the largest groups are where changes will generate the greatest impact.</p> <p><u>Proposed cell size and n-size</u></p> <p>Christina and Cesar prepared calculations with the data using various cell sizes, n-sizes and risk ratios as requested by SEAC members. Their proposed recommendation is to stay with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) recommendation of 10 or fewer for cell-size and 30 or fewer for n-size. Their rationale is that the risk for making assertions on small numbers of students does not outweigh gains of having a few more student groups included in the analysis.</p> <p><u>Proposed risk ratio thresholds</u></p> <p>Christina and Cesar made the following proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) a risk ratio of 2.25 which is below the national average of 2.5 to 3.0;</li> <li>2) three consecutive years of data above the risk-ratio threshold per cell;</li> <li>3) reasonable progress defined as three consecutive years of a risk ratio above the threshold showing continuous progress (reduction) from year to year; and</li> <li>4) action to prevent SD taken when the risk ratio is 1.75.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Proposed Thresholds Discussion</b></p>	<p>Joanne and Christina lead a discussion around the following issues related to identifying Significant Disproportionality:</p> <p><u>Hawaii's proposed thresholds compared to other states</u></p> <p>Asked for their impressions of Hawaii's recommendations compared to other states, members offered the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It appears the other states are not as invested, as they continue to maintain higher thresholds. By selecting a threshold of 2.25, Hawaii is trying to find things to improve upon.</li> <li>• I originally thought it was a good idea to look at other states; however, now I think it is better to tailor our response on our local data where we see a more unique dispersion of ethnic groups.</li> </ul> <p>Joanne suggested that a role for SEAC might be to explain Hawaii's recommendations using a simple infographic.</p>	

<p><b>Proposed Thresholds Discussion (cont.)</b></p>	<p><u>Factors affecting differences in group performance</u>                  Members broke up into 2-3 person groups to come up with reasons for the over-identification/disproportionality of particular ethnic groups.                  Suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• standardized testing favoring majority ethnic groups and a lack of testing accommodations;</li> <li>• self-selection by Native Hawaiians;</li> <li>• socio-economic status and homelessness;</li> <li>• the education level of the parents along with cultural issues;</li> <li>• families who are bi-lingual being not as verbal or fluent in English;</li> <li>• parents who have had negative associations with school as students not wanting to partner with the school in their child’s education;</li> <li>• late identification of special education eligibility;</li> <li>• bias on the part of educators involved in the referral and identification of students for special education eligibility.</li> </ul> <p><u>Examples of educator bias</u>                  Members were asked how bias might play out in schools and provided the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the past, more Native Hawaiian students were identified as emotionally disabled which fits with the number of out of school suspensions. Also Native Hawaiian students are identified with an Intellectual Disability between 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade when they may not have been exposed to Response to Intervention. If the teacher doesn’t have the tools to provide modifications, then referrals are made.</li> <li>• I work with Micronesians who are incarcerated. Many have been forced to migrate to Hawaii to get medical treatment for their children. They have their own cultural concepts about what is appropriate around alcohol and sex and have no clue that they may be breaking Hawaii laws. They also don’t have an understanding of special education.</li> <li>• The Marshall Islands have a total population of less than 70,000, and many have been forced to migrate to Hawaii, including parents of children with autism. With the submerging of the atoll with rising seas, we may see a larger number of Marshallese coming to Hawaii and Guam.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

<p><b>IDEA Funding Application</b></p>	<p>Christina reported that Hawaii’s annual application for IDEA funding is due May 18, 2018. Due to the federal budget situation, no new funding figures are available, and states have been directed to use funding data from last year. Individuals wishing to comment on the application have until April 16, 2018.</p>	<p>The application can be viewed at:  <a href="http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/PartBapp2018.pdf">http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/PartBapp2018.pdf</a></p>
<p><b>Annual Performance Report/State Systemic Improvement Plan</b></p>	<p>Christina reported on the following items:  <u>Update on Annual Performance Report (APR) data</u>        Given the limitation on time, Christina skipped over the data for the 16 indicators and directed members to the DOE website for the final APR for SY 16-17.  <u>State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) submission</u>        The SSIP—Indicator 17 of the APR—is due in D.C. on April 2<sup>nd</sup>. DOE is currently going through a review and is considering how the SSIP might change depending on OSEP’s guidance for the next 6 year cycle.  <u>SSIP data for 16-17</u>        The percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students with disabilities (OHD, SLD and SoL) who were proficient in reading dipped slightly from SY 15-16 and missed the target by 11 percentage points. While the Department is concerned, it acknowledges that implementation of reading strategies could have been hampered by changes in leadership and resulting systemic instability. With a new Superintendent and other leadership changes, there is a clear prioritization of special education.  <u>Progress in implementing the SSIP</u>        The three improvement strategies were Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), evidence-based practices and stakeholder engagement. To measure progress, three questions were considered:        1) How did sped leadership share implementation strategies?        2) How did stakeholder engagement inform implementation and decision-making?        3) How was the fidelity of implementation determined and supported?        One change in collecting evidence of implementation was to look for artifacts (i.e. school websites, CAS Leadership meetings, BOE meetings).</p>	<p>To view the APR, go to:  <a href="http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx">http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx</a>.</p> <p>The SSIP can be viewed at:  <a href="http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/SSIPPhase3Y2.pdf">http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/SSIPPhase3Y2.pdf</a>.</p>

<p><b>Annual Performance Report/State Systemic Improvement Plan (cont.)</b></p>	<p><u>Progress in implementing the SSIP (cont.)</u>        Evidence on implementation and outcomes examined included IDEA projects, Complex Area plans, DES meeting minutes, professional development, walk-through observations and the SQS.  <u>SSIP data quality issues</u>        These included limited common data elements across schools and complexes, the issue of qualitative free text fields in eCSSS, variations in the depth and breadth of data submitted, and the discretionary status of documentation and evidence that limited comparisons.  <u>Plans for improving SSIP data quality</u>        A more focused data collection and analysis process will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alternative methods of data collection;</li> <li>• the use of existing planning and implementation support artifacts;</li> <li>• common data elements and inter-rater calibration activities, and</li> <li>• access to course evaluation data.</li> </ul> <p><u>Progress toward achieving intended SSIP improvements</u>        Christina shared that while the majority of SSIP objectives were met, two were flagged for concerns: state Professional Learning Communities and engaging stakeholders by co-creating information to move the initiative along.  <u>Plans for SY 18-19</u>        These include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Following the recommendations of the SPED Review Task Force;</li> <li>2) Applying the Superintendent’s three High Impact Strategies— School Design, Teacher Collaboration and Student Voice;</li> <li>3) Continuing Leading by Convening; and</li> <li>4) Guidance from the Harwood Institute (focused on developing policy and practice that engages stakeholders).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Specific Areas for SEAC Feedback</b></p>	<p>Christina and Joanne talked to members about specific areas where they desire SEAC feedback and participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>√ Deciding on next steps</li> <li>√ Co-creating products, and</li> <li>√ Partner relationship, including a message from stakeholders.</li> </ul>	

## SEAC Minutes

March 9, 2018

Page 8

<b>Specific Areas for SEAC Feedback (cont.)</b>	They relayed that other people are hearing positive things about SEAC, and asked members if there is something that we as a group want included as part of partnership development. Joanne stressed the importance of emailing members who are not present at the March meeting and/or who may not be able to stay for the afternoon working session to keep them informed and involved. A goal is to get past just informing stakeholders and move to an active co-creation of materials to take to each member's networks. It is a commitment to move beyond sharing information. The Harwood Institute is talking to state leaders about having shared decision-making and active partnerships. "Radical inclusion" is where governments need to go to make a difference.	
<b>Agenda Setting for April 13, 2017 Meeting</b>	The two major agenda items identified by members were: 1) Have members of the Superintendent's Special Education Task Force report on their activities/recommendations, and 2) Report on the afternoon working session and follow up on priorities for shared products.	
<b>Input from the Public</b>	A parent of a 10 <sup>th</sup> grader from the Windward side asked members to view a KHNL news clip regarding her son being excluded from a school field trip. Her son has autism and Down Syndrome and is eligible for 504, as well as ADA and IDEA, protections. After planning for him to be included in a general education excursion to Waikiki, he missed the bus because his mom was waiting at a different spot on campus. When she discovered the bus had left she offered to drive him to Waikiki but was told that he was not allowed to travel in a private vehicle. Mom asked SEAC to look into the matter and notify her if more information was forthcoming. She also asked Christina if parents could have access to complex area materials referenced in one of the slides and was told that the materials were not available to the public.	The news clip was accessed through the internet and viewed.