**SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**Draft Minutes – February 12, 2021**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Andrea Alexander, Virginia Beringer, Debbie Cheeseman, Rebecca Choi (for Mary Brogan), Mark Disher, Martha Guinan, Scott Hashimoto, Amanda Kaahanui (staff), Annie Kalama (liaison to the Superintendent), Tina King, Bernadette Lane, Dale Matsuura, Kaili Murbach, Kiele Pennington, Kaui Rezentes, Susan Rocco (staff), Rosie Rowe, David Royer, Steven Vannatta, Lisa Vegas, Jasmine Williams, Susan Wood

**EXCUSED:** Annette Cooper, Cheryl Matthews, Ivalee Sinclair, Paula Whitaker

**ABSENT:** Sara Alimoot, Brendelyn Ancheta, Sarah Man, Francis Taele

**GUESTS:** Krysta Bellevue, Linda Elento, Sandy Jessmon, Maile Martin, Lori Morimoto, Kelli Taniguchi, Brikena White

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION/ACTION** |
| **Call to Order/ Introductions** | Chair Martha Guinan called the Zoom meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and asked members and guests to introduce themselves. |
| **Update on SPP/APR 13 by the Monitoring and Compliance (MAC) Team** | Brikena White of the Management and Compliance Branch presented the secondary transition data for Indicator 13 that Hawaii submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs in early February.  Indicator 13 Checklist requirements  Hawaii uses a checklist developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) to measure compliance with the requirements of secondary transition service delivery to students with IEPs.The checklist contains 8 components, and if any component does not pass compliance standards, the student’s IEP transition planning is considered to be non- compliant.  Annual Performance Report trends for Indicator 13  Hawaii has never met the 100% target set for this indicator, with results ranging between 84.55% in FFY 2014 to 69.21% in FFY 2018. Data for FFY 2019 (2019-20) reveals a significant loss, with only 13.57% of sampled IEPs showing compliance.  Differences in file reviews from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019  The MAC team conducted more rigorous file reviews for 2019-20 to determine the barriers to compliance including:   * Reviewing 619 randomly selected files vs. 341 in the previous year, * Using a more stringent sampling confidence level and confidence interval, and * Training Complex Area and ESB staff on how to conduct file reviews using the checklist.   Components showing the least compliance  Only 51% of the files reviewed showed appropriate and measurable postsecondary goals, |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Update on SPP/APR 13 by the Monitoring and Compliance (MAC) Team (cont.)** | Components showing the least compliance (cont.)  and only 32% of the files revealed transition services, including courses of study, that would enable the student to meet postsecondary goals. On a more positive note, 85% of the IEPs indicated that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition was discussed—an improvement over the past results. The MAC team has disaggregated the data for each school to help them make improvements and track results.  HIDOE plan for improvement – MAC Branch  Lori Morimoto shared MAC improvement activities for Indicator 13 including;   * Partnering with OSEP–approved technical assistance centers, * Facilitating Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with Complex Area (CA) teams, * Providing training to CA teams on the Indicator 13 checklist, and * Providing technical assistance to ensure noncompliant files are corrected.   HIDOE plan for improvement – Exceptional Support Branch (ESB)  Annie Kalama expressed surprise that the transition data dipped more than expected, but she believes it is an accurate assessment that will provide the motivation to improve. ESB’s plan for moving forward includes some of the following components:   * Identifying post secondary transition as a statewide priority, * Redesigning Infinite Campus to integrate and highlight postsecondary planning, * Proposing that Complex Area IDEA funding be required to direct resources to post secondary activities and measurable outcomes, * Establishing an ESB/MAC/DES workgroup to develop a 3-year improvement plan, * Establishing a subgroup to include stakeholders within and outside the Department to look at how to leverage existing supports, coursework and academies, and how to support interagency partnerships better.   Questions/comments from members and guests  C. UH can help train teacher candidates on how to write post secondary (PS) goals. Q. Do measurable post secondary goals go on the transition plan? Should there be a corresponding annual goal to help meet this long-term PS goal? A. Yes. There are two goals on the IEP--annual goals and PS goals that will be met after high school.  Q. Do you follow up with students down the road to see if they met their PS goals? A. No, that is not required by IDEA, but we do have a PS outcomes survey. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Update on SPP/APR 13 by the Monitoring and Compliance (MAC) Team (cont.)** | Q. What is the name of the section of the IEP with the PS goal? A. On the top of the IEP form is a box that says “post high school goals.” If you look at the transition page in the grid, it says “post-school outcomes.” They are one and the same. The MAC Branch would like to collaborate with you at the university to do a collaborative training.  Q. Can parents have copy of the Transition Hand Book. A. I thought that I sent it to SPIN. It’s been cleared by the A.G.’s Office, so I can send it out. A. (Susan R.) SPIN received a draft document, so we did not disseminate it.  C. Parent education on transition is a barrier as well. The schools I talk to have tried to do parent education around transition, but it is a struggle. This results in very few years where the parent is participating with the school and understanding the value of planning. A. We absolutely believe in the importance of educating families about transition. If all of the IEP team members are not understanding in the same way, it won’ t help the students.  Q. Is the really low score on Indicator 13 a phenomenon of the pandemic? Is it similarly low in other states? A. I am not sure, if it’s related to the pandemic. We have not done well on this indicator and other states do not do well either. All the same, we are focused is on more than compliance, namely results. I will check with Cesar D’Agord to see how other states are faring.  Q. Are you working with the folks who attend the quarterly transition meetings? A. (Brik) Yes, we work closely with the quarterly meetings and help to plan them together with other agencies. A. (Annie) Roxanne Rokero from the Special Education Section is there today, and we are taking a closer look at how to utilize that venue.  C. (Martha) Thank you to the MAC Design Team for keeping us updated on issues. |
| **Announcements** | Report from the Design Team for CCC Input on Issues  Steven Vannatta provided a follow up from last month’s discussion on how to use the synergy and structure of the CCCs to address design issues and feed them into SEAC and its priorities. Kiele Pennington, Susan Wood and Debbie Kobayakawa met with Willie Cadena and Steven yesterday and discussed designing the connection point between SEAC and the ability to convene folks at the community level. Susan Wood added that the meeting was a brainstorming discussion looking at a two-pronged effort: 1) examining issues brought forth at CCC meetings and determining if they are due to a lack of information to families. Is it in one area only, or is it a systems issue? What should be brought to SEAC? 2) How to change from being reactive to proactive and, how does one restructure the CCC meeting format? Usually everyone just comes and gives a report. We are hoping to restructure to look at problem-based learning with real case |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Announcements**  **(cont.)** | Report from the Design Team for CCC Input on Issues (cont.)  studies. We hope to build upon that, so that when there is an issue, we can problem solve together and identify gaps--like training. Kiele added that currently it is difficult to say if an issue shared at one meeting is systemic, because the data is not there. We first need to identify barriers to participation and collaboration.  **Action: The Design Team will put together a PowerPoint presentation for the March meeting and the next State CCC Co-Chair meeting on how they are progressing. SEAC members are invited to provide ideas and observations. Annie Kalama offered to take ideas to AS Armstrong to share with Complex Area Superintendents.**  Special Education Teacher Positions for SY 20-21  Susan Rocco apologized for not yet having the data available for the meeting.  **Action: Susan R. will research the teacher personnel vacancies and provide the information via email in the next few days.**  Footsteps to Transition Fair (FTTF)  Amanda Kaahanui announced that FFTF, postponed from last October, is rescheduled for September 25, 2021. Plan A is to hold an in-person fair, and Plan B is a virtual event. Martha asked if the Fair will cover all transitions, and Amanda clarified that the emphasis is on post-secondary planning, but parents of younger children are encouraged to attend and begin planning for the future. If anyone wants to join the FTTF planning team, please email Amanda.  SPIN Transition Workshops  Amanda reported that SPIN will be offering some workshops related to transition this Spring to tide families over until the next virtual SPIN Conference in October.  **Action: Amanda will share a flyer and dates at the March meeting.** |
| **Input from the Public** | Hawaii State Public Charter School Guidelines for the Implementation of IDEA 2004  Martha shared that Linda Elento has encouraged members to review the document. If anyone has suggestions for changes, let SEAC know and we will provide feedback to the appropriate body.  NWEA Handout re: Eligibility for Compensatory Education  A grandmother in Central District reported that at a meeting with her granddaughter’s school, she was presented with a NWEA handout regarding the effect of school closures on all students. School personnel told her that unless a student with a disability falls two grade levels behind, they would not be eligible for compensatory education. Her granddaughter has only been receiving 2 days of in-person instruction a week during the pandemic, and she is 2-3 years behind her 8th grade peers. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Input from the Public (cont.)** | NWEA Handout re: Eligibility for Compensatory Education (cont.)  Her granddaughter’s IEP Team is generally very good at trying to meet her needs, but they have been instructed to follow this handout that the Vice Principal presented. The grandmother questioned what kind of training is being provided by the state.  Discussion: Annie Kalama reported that this information just recently reached ESB. It is incorrect, and the school has taken this resource article out of context. DOE has never said that a two-year delay is a requirement for COVID-19 Impact Services. She asked the grandmother for the name of the school. She also clarified that the amount of time a student with a disability receives in-person services is dependent on their needs, not on the school’s instructional model. Many students with IEPs have been attending school every day since the summer. Dale Matsuura agreed that in Honolulu District, the special education minutes in the IEP are required to be fulfilled and may include some independent work.  **Action: Annie will work with the DES in that area to make a course correction.**  LDAH presentation on strategies for students with hearing loss  Tina King left a zoom link in the chat box for a workshop by Melinda Gillinger from 1-3 p.m. today on the topic of “Hearing: Link to Language, Learning and Literacy.” It is open to all.  Appropriate referral for miscellaneous topics  A mother of a young adult with developmental disabilities in Windward District brought up a number of issues and asked for the appropriate person/office for follow-up.   1. There is a 2019 memo about how to determine when Individual Support Services are needed. The ISS memo says you have to conduct an FBA before determining ISS. In another situation, a parent asked for an FBA, because IEP members were talking about her son’s behavior. She wasn’t asking for ISS, but the IEP team turned down her request, because they said her son’s behavior wasn’t severe enough, and they could just observe his behavior for a few months. How would they know why the student was having behavior issues unless they performed an FBA? 2. Recently more than one parent has asked for a gender-specific aide but school personnel feel they can just pick and choose the gender. 3. Pat Morrissey from the Center on Disability Studies has helped this mom’s son’s IEP team with SMART post secondary goals, one of which was about ROTC. She could be a resource to other parents. 4. There is a bill out regarding special education money for charter schools. It was explained that CASs can withhold 10% of their staffing money for special circumstances, if the charter school has an extra need for funding. This doesn’t seem to be working, because charter schools can’t project 6 months in advance what their personnel needs might be. There is a |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Input from the Public (cont.)** | law in the statutes (302B-30) that schools are supposed to assess for *current* needs, not  future needs.   1. She recently saw a memo about the SPED pay differential being no more. She would like more information about this   **Action: The mother agreed to type up her questions and send them to Martha for more feedback.**  Determination of Compensatory Services  Jasmine Williams posed several questions regarding the determination of the need for COVID-19 Impact Services:   1. Based on the input from the Central District grandmother, it appears that her granddaughter’s IEP team has made a decision about COVID-19 Impact Services. Can they go back and review their decision, since it was not based on good guidance? 2. If you are only now looking at training schools on how to measure student loss, isn’t it too late? How many plans might have been overlooked because of faulty understanding? 3. Are Hawaii schools open or closed? How do you determine compensatory education, if students are not receiving their full complement of support (for example, only receiving 2 days of curriculum instruction and the other two days spent reviewing past instruction). If we are not fully open and delivering 5 days of instruction, how do we project what students might have learned, if they had a full opportunity? Isn’t that true that all students are declining? This needs to be addressed.   Discussion: Martha acknowledged that this all has to do with implementation. Annie and her team are already aware of problems and will do training on learning loss. We will do what we can to ensure that the right people get our questions. Annie clarified that the COVID-19 Impact Services training was mandatory for all educational employees at the beginning of the school year. Her team is *re-training* school personnel.  Clarification  Amanda clarified that Pat Morrissey retired from CDS in August. Martha added that although she is retired, she still available to help people and is a wonderful resource, especially for post secondary issues. |
| **Extended School Year (ESY) Services Overview and Discussion** | Annie shared information on ESY related to federal and state requirements, examples of case law, Chapter 60 requirements, and current practices and challenges.  ESY Regulations  The key requirements are that ESY is:   * necessary for provision of FAPE to student, and the primary vehicle for FAPE is the IEP; * provided beyond the normal school day; |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extended School Year (ESY) Services Overview and Discussion (cont.)** | ESY Regulations (cont.)   * in keeping with the IEP; * on an individual basis; and * not limited to a particular category of disability.   Schools cannot unilaterally limit the type, amount or duration of services.  Chapter 60 Guidelines  These guidelines go further, requiring that the IEP team consider regression and recoupment, the nature and severity of the disability, and areas of learning critical to attaining self-sufficiency and independence from caregivers. Students do not necessarily require proof of regression before ESY is considered. Susan R. added that parent agencies tried to get these guidelines included in the Chapter 60 regulations, as they were in the previous version of IDEA regulations, because they were afraid the guidelines might not be made available to parents.  Case law  Court cases have determined that 1) a single standard cannot be used as the sole determinant for ESY services, 2) regression and recoupment cannot be the only standard, and 3) past regression is not required to prove a future need for ESY services.  ESY Training  DOE developed a training module a couple of years ago. Stetson and Associates turned it into a self-paced course. It is one of five mandatory training modules for all special education teachers.  Current practices and challenges  Roughly 2050 students currently have ESY on their IEP. Tri-level challenges revolve around decision-making, coordination, personnel and implementation. Current practices include:   1. An ESY site director – typically a Complex Area Resource Teacher, 2. Clustered programs as well as home school programs, 3. ESY schedules often coinciding with summer school schedules, 4. ESY sessions generally taught by the teachers and EAs available at that school. Non-qualified teachers can be hired at a lower rate. If EAs qualify, they can be hired to teach. 5. Some complexes having their own guidelines and tools, and 6. Limited documentation of ESY in eCSSS with progress reports not necessarily part of the IEP. It may be a narrative given to parents. DOE is working to change some of that in Infinite Campus.   Challenges/barriers include the following:   1. The focus of decision-making may weigh too heavily on regression and recoupment. 2. Some practices are not consistent across the state. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extended School Year (ESY) Services Overview and Discussion (cont.)** | Challenges/barriers (cont.):   1. ESY positions are hard to staff for different reasons, often because teachers just don’t want to work, especially with the additional stresses brought on by the pandemic. 2. Teachers have to put in an application for casual pay. 3. Sites are difficult to find during the summer months with the necessary supports like showers and room cleaners. 4. There is a very narrow and traditional approach to ESY. 5. Accountability is needed for individualized and rigorous programming.   Discussion of ESY targets for improvement and potential partners  Steven explained that SEAC’s leadership team has identified some ‘big bucket’ items for improvement including: LRE/location of services, one-size-fits-all programs, narrow eligibility criteria, staffing, ESY vs. summer school, and justifying the need for ESY (predictive vs. historical data). He asked members to identify components within each bucket for further discussion, as well as new partners to help fill out our shared understanding. The goal is for SEAC as an advisory group to put forward meaningful recommendations around ESY.  Questions/comments from members and guests  Q. Are the big buckets listed in order of prioritization? A. No. The aim is for members to select which problematic aspects of ESY they would most like to delve into and work on solutions.  C. The words that bother me the most are *regression* and *recoupment*. In the field, IEP members go to these words immediately and it trips parents up, because most parents think their child loses ground when they have a break from school. The Department’s definition is different than the parent’s understanding, so we have to revisit and define common language.  C. Once regression and recoupment are brought up, it triggers a delay in services—“let’s wait and see while we collect data.” I don’t think we have good conversations about what data to take, so that everyone is clear about what will happen in the future.  Q. If a student is more than 2-3 grade levels behind, is that regression? I see the student being in a continual regression, but if there is no obvious gain or loss, the school says there is no need for ESY.  C. Colorado has a good ESY Manual. Q. Does Hawaii have a similar manual?  C. We may need to prepare families prior to the IEP discussion that data will be collected during school breaks to see if a student is losing ground academically or behaviorally and needs more time to catch up. Parents can then be better involved in the process of determining if ESY is needed.  C. My son has had ESY in the past, and we chose not to repeat it, because it wasn’t helpful.  Often the teacher is minimally qualified or not prepared to address a range of needs. It is also |

SEAC Minutes

February 12, 2021

Page 9

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extended School Year (ESY) Services Overview and Discussion (cont.)** | Questions/comments from members and guests  difficult for a teacher to individualize services for 10-15 kids, all of whose needs are different within a 2-4 week period. I would love to see an ESY manual that offers a specific standardized curriculum for kids.  C. Chapter 60 talks about not limiting the type, amount and duration of services, but I have been in meetings where they are using formulas--4 hours a day with only half of the IEP minutes of specially designed instruction. Rather than waiting for a one or two-week break to measure loss, data should be collected continuously.  C. Some of the case law cited from the10th Circuit are from states that have broader standards for ESY-- for example, emerging skills and the ability of parents to provide an educational structure at home. Q. Can we use those broader standards in Hawaii?  C. I think we should look at how schools come up with their programs. Often, they look at data in April, and then see what teacher they can get. We need to make it more proactive at the beginning of year. |
| [**Legislative Report**](http://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2.12.21-LEGISLATIVE-REPORT.docx) | Susan R. presented members with a grid of legislation from the Legislative Committee that is under consideration for SEAC testimony (see attached) along with a copy of SEAC’s testimony on SB 805—Related to the Practice of Behavior Analysis. She reviewed the Committee’s historical mandate to respond to legislation with testimony, if the basis of the legislation has been previously discussed and a general consensus or majority position has been reached. SEAC’s position is that classroom teachers should be allowed to implement Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPs) resulting from Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs), and special education teachers with licensure in severe/profound disabilities and autism should be allowed to conduct FBAs without having to obtain additional licensure as an applied behavior analyst. The Senate Education Committee removed this latter exemption, so SEAC will ask for it to be restored at future hearings. Other issues SEAC would like to support are:   * expanded reporting of newborn hearing screening results, * stipends for early childhood educators, * scholarships for special education students, * amending the Hawaii Constitution to require school systems to be *thorough and efficient*, and * computer science coursework with accommodations for students with disabilities.   **Action: Members provided tacit approval for the Legislative Committee to submit testimony on these bills.** |
| **Approval of January 8, 2021 Minutes** | No changes to the draft minutes were offered.  **Action: The draft minutes were approved as disseminated.** |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Setting for the March 12, 2021 Meeting** | Agenda items offered by members included:   * Review of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) * Legislative Committee Report * CCC reporting concerns to SEAC * ESY buckets * Report on COVID-19 Impact Services Plans   Amanda asked about updated data on how many students attend school in person and have adequate devices and hotspots. Annie said they have the data being collected for the Board of Education. Much of the information is difficult to collect because it is not part of a current data collection system. Annie is willing to do research if SEAC can offer more specific data requests. Susan R. suggested that the data dashboard given to the Board does not typically disaggregate data to identify special education students with the exception of the inclusion rate. |
| **Infographic vetting** | **Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Supports (HMTSS) – 2nd vetting**  David Royer reported that his team (including Amanda and Rebecca) made revisions based on member feedback including the following:   * Expanding the infographic to two pages; * Using larger fonts; * Connecting lines under the tier descriptions to the pyramid; * Using red type for Tier 3 instead of orange to match the pyramid color; * Enlarging the font size for *common language*; * Moving *dispelling of myths* to the right; * Revising the target population to public school teachers; * Mentioning the need for parent permission for Tier 2 and 3 supports; and * Acknowledging the need for an additional infographic to cover what families need to know about HMTSS.   The team intends to send the SEAC-approved infographic to Gordon Miyamoto and others in DOE for their feedback.  Questions/comments from members and guests:  C. Great job on the revisions!  Q. Is screening continuous for students? A.) Yes, students are screened 3 times a year for about 1 minute each per academic topic. Behavioral screening takes about 10-15 minutes.  Q. Will people be concerned that screening is taking away from instruction? A. They might, but it |
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| --- | --- |
| **Infographic vetting (cont.)** | **Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Supports (HMTSS) – 2nd vetting (cont.)**  does not. Behavioral screening is done by faculty in a faculty meeting. The academic screenings are already being done. They are considered benchmarks. There will be future notification to parents of the benefits of screening.  C. On the second page, you use different colors for statements on the right column, but those colors don’t match up with the colors assigned to the three tiers. Maybe you could use one color for this section to avoid confusion.  **Action: Members approved the latest version, including the suggested changes, to go out to other stakeholders.**  **IEP Team Members – 3rd review**  Mark Disher thanked Amanda for her technical assistance on using Venngage. He and Kaili Murbach tried to incorporate the latest suggestions into their revised infographic as follows:   * Making it more obvious that the family and child are part of the core group, * Simplifying the descriptions in the boxes, and   Sticking with their original vision of having the family in the middle of the team, matching colors, and putting a border around the core team members to make them stand out.  Feedback:   * It looks great! * It supports my understanding.   **Action: Members approved the latest version for distribution to the public.**  **Diploma vs. Certificate – 2nd review**  Lisa Vegas and Andrea Alexander made the following revisions based on member feedback:   * The group started with the Venn diagram and went into more detail with the second side-by-side infographic. * The target audience for both infographics is families and school staff.   Questions/comments from members and guests  C. During the last review there was input about whether DOE allows you to plan for a diploma going past four years of high school. How can we get clarification on bullet 2? I have heard that, too. We don’t map out 5- or 6-year plans for diplomas. Do we need to change the statement that says “student has until the day before their 22nd birthday to earn his/her high school diploma”? How do we get clarification?  C. We know that when a student obtains a diploma, they are out. We don’t hear that if student is struggling and wants a diploma, the student has the extra time to earn it. How do we influence what staff knows about this? We need to ensure that all complexes know about it. |
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| --- | --- |
| **Infographic vetting (cont.)** | **Diploma vs. Certificate – 2nd review (cont.)**  C. At Olomana School we do talk about it. All our kids are on a diploma track. We do tell them they have until age 22 to earn their diploma.  C. That’s not the norm, so many folks within the DOE don’t know.  Q. Is the reason we have up to age 22 because students without disabilities have that long? Does a general education student go to adult school to get their diploma? Does the sped student go to an adult program or stay in school? A. It depends on the IEP meeting and what credits are needed. Some students don’t want to remain on the school campus after 18, so they may be offered online courses. If students haven’t received a diploma, we need to continue to offer FAPE.  C. You may want to add a sentence about the student and the IEP team determining if the student stays on campus or gets support in the community.  Q. Do you prefer the side-by-side document over the Venn diagram? Which one do you prefer? A. The Venn diagram is more simplified; we envision a double-sided document.  C. I like the wording the way it is. If you want to talk about placement options, perhaps you can think about adding that to a dialogue guide on the topic to further explain it.  C. Placement is an IEP Team decision. All will be individualized.  C. My concern is the lack of knowledge in the field and the fact that a lot of these infographics are going out without a dialogue guide. Many people may get the information without more discussion or information provided through dialogue, so the clearer we can be with the stand-alone infographic, the better.  C. On the second page I don’t see anything about special education or IEPs, so it might be construed as applying to all students. You might want more clarification.  C. If you are not a special education student, you would not be offered a certificate.  C. Perhaps it can be clarified through the subtitle, such as “the key differences between two high school paths for a student with an IEP.”  C. It’s important for people to understand that this all came about because of a 9th Circuit Court Decision—the E.R.K. decision. It found that IDEA students were being discriminated against, because Hawaii’s adult schools did not offer opportunities for non-disabled students to obtain their diploma. If they did, the Court would not have required Hawaii to extend special education eligibility to the student’s 22nd birthday. For students over age 20 who received compensatory services through the E.R.K. decision, it was clearly understood that these services should be provided in the community, because it was not age-appropriate to hold them back on a high school campus. |
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| --- | --- |
| **Infographic vetting (cont.)** | Questions/comments from members and guests  C. My child was supposed to participate in graduation ceremonies as a sped student on a certificate path. Would it be appropriate to add something to the infographic about possibly participating in graduation ceremonies with peers but staying in school because they are on a certificate route? A. Students and families are offered the option to participate in graduation ceremonies with their peers when on a certificate track or to wait, and most choose to “walk” with their friends and same-age peers.  Q. Would that be something we want to include then?  C. It could also be part of the discussion in a dialogue guide.  C. The Venn diagram might be beneficial to teachers, so that they can describe the benefits of each choice.  C. With the Venn diagram version, someone might think there are three tracks—diploma, diploma *and* certificate or certificate.  C. You may want to import the subtitle to the Venn version, too, and for the overlap section say “both include” or “common ground” or “similarities.”  C. Lisa will ask Annie and Brik to take a look at the final draft. |
| **Draft templates for Dialogue Guide and Q & A Document** | FAQ Template  Susan R. shared a template of a FAQ document, as suggested by Paula Whitaker in a previous discussion, which could be linked to each infographic when there are a lot of questions generated by the topic. Susan plans to look at the notes from our past infographic vetting sessions and use the questions posed by members and guests to “populate” the FAQ template for each topic. There are a number of formal FAQ documents on a number of topics—some put together by the Office of Special Education Programs—so the question to the group is “how extensive do we make our Q & A documents?”  Sample Dialogue Guide  Susan acknowledged that SEAC’s vision of the dialogue guide as a way to get everything clarified and commonly understood is somewhat faulty. The purpose of the dialogue guide, as envisioned by the IDEA Partnership, was as a means to get more community support and understanding for thorny, hard-to-solve issues facing special education. The dialogue guide typically centered around a formal report on an issue. Then you have dialogue with mixed stakeholders or a targeted group. By asking questions, you add to the group's knowledge and surface various perspectives. Hopefully the dialogue results in new solutions or giving weight for an existing solution. It acts as a feedback loop. When and if SEAC takes our infographics into the field for small group dialogues, we will come back to our membership and say “this is what we found out from this group.” |
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| **Draft templates for Dialogue Guide and Q & A Document (cont.)** | [Dialogue Guide on 3rd Grade Literacy](http://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/3rd-Grade-Literacy-Dialogue-Guide.pdf)  Susan R. and Steven began by expanding on one of SEAC’s early infographics—**I Can Help My Keiki Learn to Read**—developed by Dale Matsuura, Tricia Sheehey, Steven and Susan R. They used the template shared by Joanne Cashman on how to design a dialogue guide. The resulting draft guide replicates sections in a sample guide about AHDH and includes these steps:   * Target audiences * Explain the contents of the guide, including infographic(s), * Invite readers to freely share the information, * Provide SEAC’s infographic vision, * Describe the purpose of the guide, * Provide an exploration of the infographics, * Describe what is meant by dialogue, * Include reaction questions and application questions, * Explain how to host a dialogue * Add a resource section.   Steven spoke to the challenge of trying to create a sense of urgency and need among stakeholders. When we ask reactive questions, we need to give every audience member an opportunity to express their thoughts and reactions. One of the pieces in putting together a community dialogue is to invite a local expert who can bring the issue to life. This is a meaningful way to advance SEAC’s infographics and involve other stakeholders in problem-solving.  **Action: Susan provided a** [**link to the IDEA Partnership’s page dialogue guide samples**](http://www.ideapartnership.org/using-tools/dialogue-guides.html)**. Members will review the sample dialogue guide on early literacy with an eye to making our dialogue process more streamlined.** |