

Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel

Date: February 13, 2015

Facilitators: Nancy Ankeny Hunt

Panel Secretary: Julie Carmer

Present: Valerie Baker, Craig Barnum, Carma Betz, Kurtis Broeg, Jan Collinson , Billy Jo Cowley, Donita Dettmer, Margaret Joan Ebersold, Susan Etscheidt, Cari Higgins, Dawn Jacobsen, Kendra Jochimson, Amy Liddell, Susie Lund, Larry Martin, Joseph McAbee , Keri Osterhaus, Melanie Patton, Beth Rydberg , Sandra Smith, Mary Stevens, Karen Thompson, Kelly Wallace, Doug Wolfe, Jason Yessak

Department Staff Present: Barb Guy, Nancy Ankeny Hunt, Julie Carmer

Absent: Cari Higgins, Ron Koch, Emily Sopko, Kathleen Van Tol, Kelly Von Lehmden, Ruth Frush, Keri Osterhaus, Joel Weeks

Guests: Xiaoping Wang, Shanlyn Seivert

Handouts for the February 13, 2015 meeting:

- Agenda ([LiveBinder](#))
- Minutes from 1/9/2015 meeting ([LiveBinder](#))
- Attendance Center Rankings – Growth Model ([LiveBinder](#))
- SPDG – Conceptual Model for Technical Assistance on SDI ([LiveBinder](#))
- Stages of Implementation ([LiveBinder](#))
- APR – 2013B ([LiveBinder](#))
- B8 Representativeness ([LiveBinder](#))
- B8Corrective Action Plan ([LiveBinder](#))
- B13 Representativeness ([LiveBinder](#))
- B14 Representativeness ([LiveBinder](#))

Welcome/Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Kurtis Broeg.

Approval of Consent Agenda (Minutes, 1/9/2015)

Motion made by Karen Thompson to approve, second by Dawn Jacobsen Motion approved.

Welcome/Implementation Activity: Each participant talked about something they have implemented either personally or professionally.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

Consent Agenda: There were no corrections to Consent Agenda

Attendance Center Rankings—Growth Model: Healthy Indicators & ACR ([LiveBinder](#))
(Presentation by Xiaoping Wang, DE Administrative Consultant)

- The attendance Center Ranking (ACR) requirements were established by House File (HF) 215 of the 2013 legislative session—Section 73 of HF 215
- In the fall, we will push out a ranking system with 9 indicators
ACR required measures (see slide 3) – 4 of the measures are based on Iowa Assessments (Those in italics are still under development)
 - Student Proficiency (Jan 2015)
 - Academic Growth (Jan 2015)
 - Attendance Rates (Fall 2015)
 - *Parent Involvement (Fall 2016)*
 - Employee Turnover (Fall 2015)
 - *Community Activities and Involvement (2016-2017)*
 - Closing Gaps Score (Spring 2015)
 - Graduation Rates (Fall 2015)
 - College Readiness Rates (Fall 2015)
- Student proficiency is based on cut scores
- College Readiness is based on a correlation between the ACT scores.
- NAPE is the only assessment that can be used to compare to different states. Iowa has slipped so we are now average in terms of NAPE scores.

ACR: Ranking System

6 performance categories for the performance grade (ranking vs category):

- Exceptional
- High performing
- Commendable
- Acceptable
- Needs improvement
- Priority

40% percent of high school students are college ready.

Report Preview – <http://reports.educateiowa.gov/acr>

Shows proficiency and growth by building

41.08% of students on IEPs met their growth trajectory from 2013-2014 (see bar graph)

Q- Will these measures be replaced by Smarter Balance?

A- Law still says that we use Iowa Assessments; wait for legislative decision; it will not be implemented until 2016-17

Legislative Update (Shanlyn Seivert): Legislative Liaison for the Department of Education

- State Supplemental Aid for Schools
- School start dates – [HF 13](#) & [SF 47](#)
- Modify At-risk, Alternate Schools, and Returning Drop-out Prevention and Funding [HSB 61](#) and [SSB 1074](#)
- Bullying Bill - [HSB39](#) and [SSB1044](#)
- Payment of Student Costs, Psychiatric Facilities - [HSB 18](#) and [SSB 1047](#)
- Child Care Oversight and Licensing – [HSB 9](#) and [SSB 1048](#)
- Gap Tuition Assistance Tuition - [SSB1056](#)
- Virtual Academies - [HF97](#)

Updates (SDI, IEP/IFSP, Child Find, APR Update):

SPDG Update & Levels of Implementation Activity:

- SPDG – Just submitted to the feds
- Grant is for SDI
- 5 year grants – 1 million/year
- Most will go to AEA and LEAs to provide PD
- Conceptual Model- There are 4 primary reasons for a need for technical assistance:
 1. Unaware of needed change
 2. Need knowledge or skills to implement with fidelity and achieve the necessary improvement.
 3. Current service delivery issues prevent fidelity of implementation and improvement from occurring.
 4. Change efforts stall or are never fully achieved due to resistance that can arise in the process

The reason for assistance determines the type of assistance needed and the effective strategy. (See handout on [LiveBinder](#))

Small group conversation about strategies:

Think about something you are working on now either in your own work or special education—what are some of things you would like to change and what is happening now.

- Not all strategies are created equal. The Department uses the following project type definitions:
 1. Discovery/Investigation – identify cause of poor outcomes
 2. Development – testing of practices in small numbers
 3. Validation – assess the effectiveness through evaluation
 4. Scale-up – expand project to the state level

SDI:

- SDI group refined key components and critical features and created a visual representation. Iowa’s framework for specially designed instruction:
 - Diagnose – for instructional design
 - Design – for instructional delivery

- Deliver - for learner engagement
- Engage – for learning

Feedback:

The group thought that the “engage” piece looked like an end product instead of being threaded throughout the process not a by-product or outcome.

If we are going to use the “how” cascade for imp design, the engagement features in the “why” section need to also be reflected in the design.

SPDG Objectives:

1. Continue to build our technical assistance system to support districts and buildings to provide good/effective SDI (need external and internal coaches)
2. Training and providing supports to the coaches
3. Quality PD and ongoing support

Continuation of SSIP Discussion: (Sandy Nelson)

What is the current reality?

- Data from the Universal Screening Data from Fall 2014 is being used to determine current reality
- (98% of schools use the FAST assessment)
- FAST can be administered up to 6th grade
- Universal screeners are given 3x per year
- Universal tier should be meeting the needs of 80% of kids
- Cut scores are indicators of a successful reader by the end of 3rd grade. K-2 students should hit the benchmarks to be proficient by 3rd grade.

SSIP workgroup came up with the potential factors and indicators that have an impact on all readers’ success (including those on IEPs).

Updates:

SDI- Barb’s presentation provided the update

IEP – no update

Child Find – Modules and scripts have been approved; Release will happen in mid-March; Karen will provide a demo during the March meeting

SPP/APR- APR is submitted. It did not include Indicator 8 data (parent survey data). There were number of reasons why which will be resolved. OSEP was notified. We have an action plan in place to ensure it won’t happen again. All is on [LiveBinder](#).

Next meeting is scheduled **Friday, March 27** at the Grimes State Office Building

Karen Thompson – motion to adjourn; Doug Wolfe seconded

Meeting was adjourned at 2:42 pm.