



Special Education Advisory Panel

APPROVED MINUTES

Meeting Place: Virtual Meeting

Address: Microsoft Teams platform

Date: Monday, April 19, 2021 (4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.)

Agenda:

4:30 Come to Order

4:30-4:35 Review and Approve Minutes, Questions on Executive Board Actions

4:35-4:45 Story Share

4:45-5:00 Subcommittee Updates

5:00-5:30 Unmet Needs Presentation and Recommendations for Approval

5:30-6:30 AOE Target Setting: Indicators 8 & 14

6:30-7:25 AOE IDEA Part B Grant: Application Public Comment, Fiscal Processes

7:25-7:30 Public Comment

7:30 Adjourn

Present: Sarah Fabrizio, Sandra Chittenden, Sara Kruk, Crista Yagjian, Jacqui Kelleher, Barbara Joyal, Carrie Lutz, Jennifer Perry, Scarlett Dun, Rachel Seelig, John Spinney, Mary Barton, Mark Formel, Tara Howe, Kaiya Andrews, Cassidy Canzani, Joy Wilcox, Vickie Haskins, Danielle Howes, Ana Kolbach, Kristen Bigelow, Mary Lundein, Linda Moreno, Molly McFaun, Betty Roy, Susan Comerford

Call to order:

Rachel asked for volunteer roles to help facilitate the meeting.

Review and Approve Minutes, Questions on Executive Board Actions:

There was a delay in getting the March meeting minutes onto the AOE website, the March minutes will be tabled to be discussed and reviewed during the May meeting.

Story Share:

Rachel shared her personal story that led to where she is now. Thank you so much for sharing your personal story with the panel.

Subcommittee Updates:

Evaluations and Reporting is waiting for Chris Kane to bring back more information, once the subcommittee receives this information it will be brought back to the full panel. The evaluations subcommittee also reviewed SSIP indicators 8, 14, and 16.

Membership and Bylaws is currently focusing their time on recruiting and membership. The membership subcommittees is continuing promote the panel to potential members

Rules and Regs: had no update.

Unmet Needs is looking for feedback from the panel. The Unmet Needs document which was shared prior to the meeting has a numerical list of unmet needs identified by the subcommittee. With the documentation there is the place for the unmet need, questions/comments, recommendations, and examples.

The Unmet Needs Group is looking for panelist to share their lived experiences and to provide feedback on the specific unmet needs to prioritize first. The feedback to the panel is due on 4/26/21.

Unmet Needs Presentation and Recommendations for Approval:

Carrie picked a few of the Unmet Needs to discuss together as a group. The first Unmet Need was around an accessibility required policy and district-wide accessibility professional development. John asked within the example if the school district knew of the resource, book find. Carrie stated that she wasn't aware of the specifics of the situation. John offered to help support the work of the Unmet Needs Committee within the document to help provide insight, opportunities, and resources that the AOE can provide.

The subcommittee next moved onto another Unmet Need regarding child find, Rachel mentioned an emphasis on the harder to find kids and the need to help children that aren't in the system on how to find those kids. The discussion continued with recommendations and personal stories from parents being a part of the IEP and how to strengthen this gap.

A recommendation was suggested to streamline the special education process statewide, including specific guidelines regarding the parental rights, to color code assessments results to provide a clear picture for all participants, and providing parents a binder to keep important documents in. The final topic for discussion was around the support of transition services for post high school services, recommendations made it improve this unmet need included professional development specific on transition services for high school special educators and improving the connection between a student's IEP and PLP.

AOE Target Setting: Indicators 8 & 14:

Betty reviewed the current percentage of people that have responded to the parent survey, how the data is collected, and the changes that were recently made to the parent survey which was a result from a collaboration with the evaluations subcommittee and the AOE. Betty also answered the questions the panel had asked prior to the meeting during the AOE Jamboard presentation. Additional thoughts or questions that the panel had after reviewing were added to a new Jamboard, and the Jamboard will continue to remain open if the panelist would like to add any additional questions. During the discussion, a question was raised to see if it is possible for a rolling collection of the parent survey, where the parent would receive the survey soon after their IEP meeting. This could yield more actionable information on the parent survey. The AOE team will look into this as a potential option of how to distribute the parents survey.

John Spinney presented on indicator 14. Indicator 14 is the number of students one year after they graduate are either employed or in some Post-Secondary educational setting. This information is collected by a phone survey. John shared the historical data for measures a, b, and c. A challenge that exists for this work with this type of survey is it is very difficult to receive access to student's phone numbers. Another concern was raised around how impersonal the questions are asked. During the discussion ideas recommendations were given on how the survey can be improved, the panel offered to collaborate with the AOE to improve the survey, similar to the work completed on the parent survey. A panelist requested more information around what other states' percentage of students go on to continue their further education to help guide future target setting discussions.

The panel is charged with providing recommendations on what the new target numbers should be for the next six years. The panel can make their recommendations by a set number, target, a range, or a description of target setting.

AOE IDEA Part B Grant: Application Public Comment, Fiscal Processes:

Jacqui Kelleher presented the IDEA Part B interactive spreadsheet which is on the AOE website with the panel. Jacqui explained the administrative cost, additional funding, and how the optional authorizations funding is broken down. Jacqui is looking for public comment on the part b application specifically around the optional authorized activities and what categories are being funded.

Jacqui stated that this is a financially tight budget and that if optional authorized activities monies are allocated into different areas other items would need to be removed from the budget. One question that was raised is how much does it equate to, what does it mean in people hours etc., grant deliverables around what does the numbers mean? Jacqui offered to provide more information to the panel at the next meeting.

A recommendation was made that two areas where IDEA B money should be shifted to is reducing the paperwork and recruitment/hiring. Mary L shared her concerns as an LEA in Chittenden county which typically does not struggle to find employees and how recently she has received a few applications for open positions along with unqualified people for the job.

In the past the panel has continued the work in a subcommittee to create a written public comment which is then voted on by the panel. With the timeline of public comment ending on 4/31/21 there isn't enough time for this to occur.

Jen Perry presented the responsibilities of the AOE IDEA-B 611 and 619 funding is broken down, along with deadlines for school districts, and what are considered eligible funds for special education. The financial side of special education is an important piece of the puzzle and is connected to the SIIP target setting.

Public Comment:

None

Adjourn:

Crista motions to adjourn the meeting, Scarlett seconded
Meeting adjourned at 7:33pm.

Meeting Schedule (Hold the Dates):

May 18, 2021 4:30-7:30 (Tuesday)

June 23, 2021 4:30-7:30 (Wednesday)

July – TBD

August – TBD

September 23, 2021 4:30-7:30 (Thursday)