**SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**Draft Minutes – March 12, 2021**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Sara Alimoot, 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, Dale Matsuura, Cheryl Matthews, Kaili Murbach, Wendy Nakasone-Kalani, Kiele Pennington, Carrie Pisciotto, Kaui Rezentes, Susan Rocco (staff), Rosie Rowe, David Royer, Steven Vannatta, Lisa Vegas, Jasmine Williams, Paula Whitaker, Susan Wood

**EXCUSED:** Annette Cooper, Bernadette Lane, Ivalee Sinclair

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

**GUESTS:** Daintry Bartoldus, Patty Dong, Linda Elento, Sandy Jessmon, Rachel Miller, Lori Morimoto, C.J. Rice, Roxanne Rokero, Cara Tanimura, 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. |
| **SPP/APR FFY 2020-25 Part B Changes at a Glance** | Cara Tanimura and her team from the Monitoring and Compliance (MAC) Branch—Brikena White, Lori Morimoto and Patty Dong—briefed members on the anticipated changes to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2020-25. Links were provided to the current measurement table (2019-20) and the new measurement table (2020-21).  Stakeholder engagement for SPP/APR  The MAC team is committed to involving SEAC and other key stakeholders in data analysis, target/baseline setting, improvement strategies and assessing progress. Beginning with the April SEAC meeting, time will be set aside to discuss those indicators that have been revised. The SPP/APR submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in February will be posted on the HIDOE website in early May, after the review is final.  Indicators Under Revision  Nine of the seventeen SPP indicators have been identified by OSEP for changes in the next APR. Of those nine, two indicators requiring a change in data source—Graduation (1) and Dropout (2)—will not affect Hawaii because Hawaii is already using the required data source (618 Exit Data).  Statewide Assessments (Indicator 3)  This indicator removes 3rd grade as an assessment point and adds 4th grade and high school along with 8th grade. It also creates a new sub indicator measuring the proficiency for students with disabilities assessed against alternate standards.  Suspensions/Expulsions (Indicators 4A and 4B)  Changes include a new definition of long term suspensions, the addition of cell size in addition to ‘n’ size, and permission for the state to set its own discrepancy rate. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPP/APR FFY 2020-25 Part B Changes at a Glance (cont.)** | School age LRE (Indicator 5)  The primary change to this indicator splits the age group of 5 year olds and records only those attending kindergarten.  Preschool age LRE (Indicator 6)  This indicator now only measures 5 year olds who are still in preschool. It also adds a measurement (6C) for students receiving their special education services at home as determined by the IEP.  Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)  A new requirement is that states must indicate the extent to which their demographics are representative by considering race and ethnicity plus at least one additional demographic such as age, gender, geographic area, etc.  Secondary Transition (Indicator 13)  OSEP added language that if representatives of participating agencies are invited to the meeting, they should be likely to provide or pay for transition services, including pre-employment transition services.  Postsecondary Outcomes (Indicator 14)  Analysis of data representative of demographics must include race and ethnicity plus one other demographic approved by stakeholder input.  Approval of the MAC Branch Calendar for Reviewing Indicators  Martha asked members if they approved of the proposed indicator discussions tentatively scheduled from April through November. Susan R. suggested that SEAC may want to emphasize some indicators over others based on their perceived importance for student success. Martha agreed to move the discussion to agenda setting.  Questions/comments from member and guests  C. Earlier this year, we talked about having MAC come back and talk more about disproportionality and drilling down to Hawaii specific ethnicity data. A. We can incorporate that when we present on indicators 9 and 10.  C. Please share a copy of your PPT with members. A. It has been forwarded to SPIN to share with members. |
| **State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Review** | Annie Kalama shared that her Branch is still working on the SSIP Report and must report progress on April 1.  History of the SSIP  For newer SEAC members, Annie offered a brief background on Indicator 17 – the SSIP. In 2014, |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Review (cont.)** | History of SSIP (cont.)  OSEP introduced a new accountability system called Results Driven Accountability. It shifted from monitoring compliance only to looking for results of improved student outcomes. The SSIP was conceived as a 5-year plan, using a systems approach to identify gaps, analyze state systems and implement targeted evidence.  Hawaii Target  Hawaii’s SSIP focuses on 3rd and 4th grade reading (ELA) scores for students eligible for special education under Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech or Language Disabilities or Other Health Disability to measure if our state plan is effective.  Improvement Activities  These include:   1. building capacity using professional learning communities (PLCs), 2. implementing and evaluate chosen literacy evidence-based practices, and 3. engaging stakeholders through Leading by Convening, a collaborative approach to decision making.   Current Phase  The SSIP to be submitted in April reports on Phase III, Year 5. OSEP has extended the timespan of the SSIP and has not required new plans. However, Hawaii can revise its current plan. The responsibility for the SSIP moved from the MAC Branch to the Exceptional Support Branch last year, because many of the activities involve supporting and informing the field on changing practice.  SY 19/20 data  OSEP allowed a template with a lot more structure and recognized that data would be impacted by the pandemic. When the plan was formed in 2015, there were district professional learning teams, but they have evolved into Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). It has been challenging collecting information on the use of evidence-based practices (EBPs), because standard classroom observation checklists don’t include the EBPs used in the plan. Stakeholder collaboration has included meeting with parent partner agencies, creating shared infographics and building a culture of mutual respect and trust. Professional development activities have included modules, Hui Pu trainings and technical assistance with District Educational Specialists.  Performance data  Because the Smarter Balance Assessment was postponed due to the pandemic, screener data (iReady and STAR) was used to document student performance. ESB staff pulled longitudinal |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPP/APR FFY 2020-25 Part B Changes at a Glance (cont.)** | reading scores and compared 2018 to 2019 scores resulting in a finding of a 4.7% increase in reading scores at or above grade level for 4th graders.  Teacher survey  In Feb. 2021, ESB surveyed all Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten through 4th grade, and resource teachers ( n = 884 ). Teachers were asked about which literacy EBPs were implemented, what progress monitoring tools are used, and what is their level of formal training in language and literacy. Survey results indicate that more intensive focus needs to be put on training all of the role groups.  Next steps  ESB is proposing a change in approach to 1) building coaching capacity, 2) increasing language and literacy expertise, 3) scaling implementation of EBPs in the classroom, and 4) providing home literacy opportunities for families. ESB is collaborating with the PTI (LDAH) to bring families to the table to empower parents and support literacy activities in the home. HIDOE is in the process of submitting an application for a state personnel development grant (SPDG) on early literacy to complement work on the SSIP. It could provide an opportunity to leverage and support systems change. Martha added that SEAC supported the grant application with a letter of support.  Questions/comments from members and guests  Q. Are you collecting ELA data on kids with the categorical eligibility of Developmental Delay? A. No.  Q. Who were the teachers surveyed? What grades? A. All preschool and all K thru 4th grade teachers. The response rate was 60% for Pre-K, 28% for K-4, and 60% for resource teachers.  Q. The SSIP focus is on reading performance of 3rd and 4th grade students, but you didn’t get as big a response from that group of teachers and their common practices. A. Right. A refocus and emphasis we are taking this year is that everything you do leading up to 4th grade has an impact on literacy, beginning with Pre-K. A strong connection with oral language development has a big impact on literacy.  Q. What efforts are made to drive up teacher participation in these surveys? I am concerned by a lack of participation and data from surveys that could better direct resources where they are needed most, especially in identifying training deficiencies. A. We asked them specifically what they needed, offered an incentive (curriculum books), and went to consult and confer with HSTA to confirm the survey wasn’t an additional workload.  Q. A number of years ago, there was an emphasis on dyslexia, and there was the creation of literacy specialists. How are these positions supporting your efforts? A. I am not sure if we have literacy |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPP/APR FFY 2020-25 Part B Changes at a Glance (cont.)** | Questions/comments from member and guests (cont.)  specialists or who they are. We want to target training to early language development and oral literacy. We will look into it to enlist support, if they have that kind of expertise.  C. SEAC was aware that OSERS extended the SSIP and even participated in a call to offer input on designing a new SSP and indicators. It doesn’t appear that OSEP adopted any meaningful changes.  C. SEAC’s concern with the choice of target for the SSIP was that literacy efforts were focused on a relatively small percentage of sped kids. A. You’re right; we are not making major changes at this time, but we are trying to tweak the plan to make sure it is effective. Moving forward we can have more dialogue about whether we need to change our Theory of Action and how to make this better.  C. At the time we focused on the SSIP, OSEP removed the requirement to have improvement activities for all the other indicators. SEAC asked what could be done to help other age groups who were still struggling with reading. If students have passed 4th grade without the necessary literacy skills, are there other activities to assist them? A. We hope that some of our other initiatives are reaching those students, including activities outside the APR. |
| **CCC Workgroup on Reporting Systems Issues** | Steven Vannatta, Susan Wood, Tina King, Debbie Kobayakawa, Kiele Pennington, and Willie Cadena have formed a workgroup on how to better connect our communities to SEAC, tease out concerns and do systems learning together. The workgroup is partnering with the Community Engagement Branch, SEAC, TACA, LDAH, Hilopaa, Ho’omana and MCH LEND. Their findings will be shared at the next CCC Co-Chair meeting.  Objectives for a Two-Prong Approach   1. Pilot a project using Problem-based Learning (PBL) process at an identified complex CCC. 2. Poll families from partner agencies and identify specific needs: information, training or systems issues.   The group is defining PBL as “a student-centered approach in which one learns about a subject by working in groups to solve an open-ended problem. This problem is what drives the motivation and the learning.” PBL is student-centered, problem-based and active. Susan W. offered a sample PBL for several students with diverse needs and described the process the workgroup would go through.  Parent Polling and Data Collection  The CCCs, TACA, LDAH and Ho‘omana have agreed to gather data from parents. Poll data would be discussed with the CCCs and the workgroup would identify trends. Systems issues would be shared with SEAC. Tina reported that the partnering agencies hope to poll quarterly using a poll with about 11 questions. The group is open to the survey being provided to service providers and other  professionals as well. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CCC Workgroup on Reporting Systems Issues (cont.)** | Questions/comments from members and guests  Q. Is it possible to enlarge the survey to make it easier to view? A. The workgroup can send a copy to Susan R. for member distribution.  C. Because we are a part of this workgroup, we wanted to try it out at our Parent Talk Café today. I added Developmental Delay as an eligibility category and moved some of the elements around.  Q. Who will you be trialing it with? A. Our parent group.  Q. Are the parents in your Parent Talk Café from all over the state? I love what you are doing, but I am concerned that if you ask a variety of families, you will get very varied responses based on a number of factors like socioeconomic status, school differences, etc. If this is a qualitative deep-dive, you will have to flesh it out more and more as the needs will be very heterogeneous. How will you qualify and tier the information? A. We plan to roll it out through the 17 CCCs and by complex area. We may find that it is just one complex area that is having an issue.  Q. Can you overlay the quantitative data we already have about schools with the most needs and achievement gaps with your qualitative polling results? A. Yes, we just have to get that data.  C. SEAC needs to vet the poll, too, if we are to be involved. A. We will talk to Kiele to get a copy of the poll out to members.  C. The data partner agencies are able to bring forth will hopefully give more robustness to the areas of focus for SEAC—a tie-in down the road that justifies SEAC’s focus on particular issues.  C. Under the hypothesis column in the PBL example, it would also be helpful to note what supports might be missing at school, not just at home. |
| **Further Discussion re: Extended School Year (ESY) and Summer Programming** | Roxanne Rokero summarized the big buckets items and their subcategories brought up at February meeting including: 1) LRE/location, 2) One-size-fits-all, 3) Narrow eligibility criteria, 4) Justifying the need for ESY (predictive vs. historical data), 5) Staffing for ESY, and 6) ESY vs. Summer School.  ESB understands that these are very legitimate and important concerns that should be addressed soon. A team at ESB will be developing guidelines and more resources to provide to schools. SEAC’s feedback will be welcome to decide on what best to focus on. ESB wants to work together on an infographic, training and guidelines, so that we all have a common understanding of ESY.  Summer learning  DOE is currently working to determine what types of earning will be offered to students this summer and designing a more streamlined process. Schools won’t be able to commit to any learning programs at their site until they know what the funding will look like. HIDOE will be using federal monies on summer learning. It takes a few months at least to plan well, so more information will be forthcoming. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Further Discussion re: Extended School Year (ESY) and Summer Programming (cont.)** | Questions/comments from members and guests  Q. Is the information on summer learning just specific to special education? A. No.  Q. If our school was beginning to put together credit recovery programs for our students as a response to the impact of COVID, should we pause, or is it okay to go ahead? A. It is okay to proceed.  Q. Can you make a simple statement of ESY criteria beyond recruitment and retention, so that I can share it with my child’s teachers? A. We are going to be working on that in the guidelines. Please contact us after the meeting with specifics of what you need and we can work with you.  C. Last year’s summer programming was somewhat chaotic, because it was last minute due to uncertainty over whether schools could open. A lot of money was spent on programs that didn’t have much impact or cost effectiveness. We have heard about a multi-million-dollar proposal to do targeted tutoring for middle school students over the summer, and last year the Department spent a lot of money on a mental health hotline answered by APRNs, but it was not utilized by many students. Q. How can SEAC influence the Department to avoid sinking millions of dollars into projects that you don’t know will be effective or utilized? A. We would like to ensure that we use funds appropriately, and this year we have a little more time to plan. One strategy is to look at what we already have in place and assess how is it meeting the needs of all students, being mindful of what works best.  C. My 15-year old son with Down Syndrome was not involved in school from March to September. He’s still working on his sight words and is not a reader. In the Fall he was able to procure an effective EA. During the first month, as they collected data, the school negated the need for COVID-Impact services, since he was doing so well. It was not a data-driven choice, and my main concern is how people in the field are assessing what regression is. A. That is a big training issue—for parents as well--on all of the factors that contribute to learning loss. COVID is new for everyone and a shift in how we do things.  Q. Maybe you can consider ESY services around the arts. Kids can do a play, for example, that can include ELA, math and communication. A. That’s a great suggestion. When official information is released on summer programming, it will be looking at how we can engage students while offering what they need.  C. It’s been a while since my son went to summer school, but when he did, they failed to engage him. He wound up during a lot of work sheets that would cause him to misbehave, and then I would have to pick him up from the program. |
| **COVID Impact Services Update** | C.J. Rice offered the following unofficial data on COVID-19 Impact Services meetings and plans:  As of March 5th the number of COVID-19 Impact (CI) Services meetings was 15,551, and the number of CI Plans was 494. The most frequently used CI service is tutoring after school or during breaks. She reminded members that this data is not intended for public distribution. ESB will be sending a reminder |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COVID Impact Services Update (cont.)** | memo to schools to discuss learning loss and discuss the remedy for students who did not make progress as expected. ESB also wants to take the return to school infographics that were produced by SPIN and parent agency partners and work with them to produce webinars to make the information more user friendly for all stakeholders.  Questions/comments from members and guests  C. These numbers only represent 60% of students with IEPs and 504 Plans. The concern is that what should have been done in the 1st Quarter still hasn’t been done by 3rd Quarter for a sizeable group of students. A. You’re right that it is important to assess skill loss for every student with an IEP or 504 Plan. That’s why we are sending out a reminder that IEP teams document COVID-19 services.  C. Kids are experiencing a loss of opportunity as well--for example, inclusion and community service/work learning.  C. During my son’s COVID Impact Services meeting additional school days were discussed and identified as a possible need, but nothing was implemented to make it happen.  C. We will soon be in 4th Quarter, and my son’s team wants to talk about learning loss from last year. It can’t be measured now effectively, because he has had services for three quarters. A. Yes, it is difficult. It’s important to look at progress reports, grades and other data that parents and teachers have.  Q. What about situations where IEP goals are not being met due to COVID related barriers? Should there be compensatory services to make up the number of minutes? A. When we look at COVID impact, it’s not a minute-by-minute thing. It’s about making up for the lost skills. In the last three quarters we have had related services provided both in-person and virtually. We want to look at how we use the 4th Qtr. and summer time to address residual skill losses.  Q. Is there a set of criteria that are considered at COVID Impact meetings? Is there training of all schools on a consistent process for talking with parents about what needs to be addressed? Are the plans individualized or are there a set number of services offered? A. That’s why we are putting tools and the reminder to address this issue out to the field.  C. Some parents have shared that at COVID meetings they are told that services such as tutoring are not available; therefore it cannot be provided. What are options for students, if the school does not provide a particular service or program? A. That’s why there is a lot of attention and direction now to summertime—not just summer school, but learning hubs and credit retrieval. ESY is only designated for a certain percentage of students, but we want to ensure that credit retrieval and other summer services are available to all students.  C. Schools are also addressing emotional and behavioral issues that have come up due to the impact of COVID, like counseling services. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COVID Impact Services Update (cont.)** | Questions/comments from members and guests (cont.)  C. Why can’t you use the window from 3rd quarter 2020 to the screening that occurred when students came back to school in the fall as the timeframe for determining COVID skill losses? Schools want to overlook that and add all the testing that has occurred since then. A. All of the schools used universal screeners at the beginning of the school year. We can also use progress monitoring. In addition, there are monthly metrics presented to the Board of Education that help to show where the DOE is as a whole. We are also looking at what additional information we need to gather.  C. Emotional-behavioral issues are also critical. A student may have left school as an A or B student, but came back to school and is now a D student, because they are not doing well learning on line, or have difficulty turning in work or getting the assistance they need. A. It’s good that ESB works in tandem with the Student Services side. They are looking at universal screeners for social-emotional needs. School based behavioral health can provide counseling, and in some cases, social workers are working with families on basic needs.  Q. Is there any talk of a do-over year? A. No. Nationally we recognize that students are struggling as a whole. We are not going back to normal. We want a new normal with stronger supports in place. Most students don’t want to delay their graduation. |
| **Announcements** | 1. Amanda shared a flyer on SPIN’s three Spring virtual workshops on transition issues:  * April 17 – **Financing the Future** covering benefits planning and information on the new Hawaii ABLE program and Kal’s Law, * May 8 – **Pathways to the Future** helping families prepare for their child’s eventual transition to adult life by learning “marathon” skills that will be used over and over on the journey. Various person-centered planning techniques will also be shared. * June 19 - **Arriving at the Future** showcasing parents and young adults who have been successful in their transition journey.   Registration will be available on the SPIN Conference website next week.   1. Roxanne Rokero confirmed that the Department has applied for an early literacy Statewide Professional Development Grant, and is awaiting notice of its status. 2. Susan R. provided an update on the Footsteps to Transition Fair. It has been moved from next October to February or March 2022 to allow for an in-person event at Windward Community College. 3. Martha’s nephew, Joe Ballard, was just sworn in as a judge in the state of Kentucky, and the family is very proud of him. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Input from the Public** | ABLE Act and Kal’s Law  Daintry Bartoldus from the State Council on Developmental Disabilities announced ABLE Account presentations in advance of the opening of a new ABLE program in Hawaii. It is a priority that the Hawaii disability community has been working on for six years. ABLE, Achieving a Better Life Experience, is a savings program for persons with disabilities that protects government benefits. The Council will be meeting with Senator Yamane to advocate for adding ABLE accounts to the tax break allowed for 529 College Saving Funds. Kal’s Law, an income disregard, raised the amount of money individuals can earn without jeopardizing their benefits like SSI. It also raised their asset limit from $2,000 to $7,900. The Department of Human Services has submitted the application for the income disregard and when implemented in a few months, it will be retroactive to January 2020.  IDEA Due Process and the Hawaii Civil Rights Commission  Linda Elento announced that the Superintendent wrote testimony for a bill excluding the Hawaii Civil Rights Commission (CRC) from jurisdiction over IDEA due process complaints. Susan R. added that CRC does not feel they have the expertise to rule on these issues.  Maintenance of Effort Funding Bill  Susan W. called attention to a bill that would guarantee more consistent funding for the Hawaii Department of Education. It would help avoid staff layoffs and offer greater financial security to schools. She will look up the bill number and share it with members. |
| **Review of Minutes for February 12, 2021** | Susan W. offered small editing corrections and Cara Tanimura corrected the status of Monitoring and Compliance as a *branch* and not an *office*.  **Action: The minutes were approved as corrected.** |
| **Agenda Setting for April 9 and May 14, 2021 Meetings** | The MAC Branch has requested time to review Indicators 5 and 6 – Educational Environments – in April and Indicators 1 (graduation), 2 (dropout) and 4A & 4B (suspensions) in May. Activities would include data trends, target/baseline setting and offering improvement strategies.  Additional agenda items offered for April 9th include:   * Infographic vetting * Legislative update * Update on summer services   Additional agenda items offered for May 14th include:   * Annual Report recommendations and year end review * Membership issues/election of officers * Discussion re: buckets/priorities for next school year. |
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| --- | --- |
| **Infographic Vetting** | Members re-reviewed three infographics for final approval:  *Partnership Using the 5 “C”s*  Workgroup members Tina King, Scott Hashimoto and Kaui Rezentes envisioned this infographic being used by families, DOE and providers. Their purpose was to encourage collaboration among stakeholders. Scott added that the group worked on consistent grammar and the infrastructure of the document.  Additional suggestions for revisions   * Mark Disher offered a minor correction under the Families column: in the first paragraph (communication) remove an extra space before the word “share.” * Martha said that initially it appears a little wordy, but she thinks the current wording is necessary to convey the ideas. She asked the group to work on ideas for the Dialogue Guide. * Jasmine asked members to look for opportunities to have this infographic and others translated into other languages.   **Action: Members congratulated the team on this infographic and voted to approve it with the recommended revisions for distribution outside SEAC**  *Certificate vs. Diploma* (a two-sided infographic)  Lisa Vegas reported for the workgroup that the two documents were sent to Annie for her review. A minor recommended change was to use the word “commonalities” on the intersecting portion of the Venn diagram. A second change was to move several of the bullets around to match the opposite columns on the side-by-side infographic.  Additional suggestions for revisions   * Martha reminded the group of the need to remove the Venngage logo on the bottom of the infographics and replace with the SEAC footer. * C.J. asked that ESB be given one last chance to clarify with the Office of Instructional Design (OCID) language regarding certificates. * Cheryl asked if a temperature check was taken with principals to make sure they are on board with the certificate vs. diploma track information, as many do not support the 5-year track for diploma. * Amanda asked permission to make the icons within the Venn circles white for a better look.   **Action**: **Members voted to approve the infographics in February pending final revisions. C.J. will let Lisa know whether OCID recommends any further changes. If not, it can be distributed.**  3rd Grade Literacy  Discussion of this infographic and its draft Dialogue Guide was deferred to the April 2021 meeting. |