

Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel

Date: May 8, 2015

Facilitators: Nancy Ankeny Hunt

Panel Secretary: Julie Carmer

Present: Julie Aufdenkamp, Craig Barnum, Carma Betz, Kurtis Broeg, Jan Collinson , Donita Dettmer, Margaret Joan Ebersold, Susan Etscheidt, Cari Higgins, Kenda Jochimsen, Amy Liddell, Susie Lund, Larry Martin, Joseph McAbee, Beth Rydberg , Sandra Smith, Mary Stevens, Kelly Von Lehmden, Kelly Wallace, Joel Weeks, Jason Yessak

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

Absent: Valerie Baker, Billy Jo Cowley, Ruth Frush, Dawn Jacobsen, Ron Koch, Melanie Patton, Emily Sopko, Karen Thompson, Kathleen Van Tol, Doug Wolfe

Guests: Sarah Brown and Greg Feldmann

Public Comment: None

Handouts for the May 2015 meeting:

- Agenda ([LiveBinder](#))
- Minutes from March 27, 2015 meeting ([LiveBinder](#))
- Welcome Activity ([LiveBinder](#))
- State Systemic Improvement Plan – Phase II ([LiveBinder](#))

Welcome/Introductions

The meeting was called to order May 8, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.

Approval of Consent Agenda (Minutes, March 27, 2015)

Motion made by Kelly Von Lehmden to approve, second by Craig Barnum. Motion approved.

Welcome Activity:

Task—1. Review this year’s accomplishments: Of what are you most proud 2. Reflect on SEAP’s mission, vision, purpose and duties: What is yet to be done?

Accomplishments:

- parent involvement at the committee level of the group
- SDI group work – drilling down into the work and setting some parameters
- Relationships that SEAP fosters and encourages enhances collaboration (for example the modules)
- SEAP is part of a bigger system that is going forward and building upon it.
- LiveBinder – saved trees

Focus:

- Continue the work on the IEP process and not lose sight of the process.
- All 3rd graders need to be proficient readers – how does this impact students with disabilities (dyslexia) and ESL students. Who is the population and who is included and is it the right thing to do?
- SDI – implementing and embedding it into the work being done
- There are a lot of changes coming (Differentiated Accountability, Smarter Balance etc) SEAP can play a role in influencing policy decisions.

SSIP—Phase 2 Barb Guy ([LiveBinder](#))

Have completed Phase 1- it was submitted to OSEP in April

State Personal Development grant- chose SDI, SIMR is readers proficient by 3rd grade

Phase II

1. Infrastructure Development-
2. Support for local implementation
3. Evaluation Plan

Plan doesn't need to be submitted until February but we will move forward with the work. Barb will take a shell of a plan to AEA Directors. It will also go through C42K.

Materials will be developed around literacy this summer (around diagnostics and delivery of instruction)

Field test in the Fall; Develop roll out plan

80% of the grant (if we get it the grant) will go towards professional development

Differentiated Accountability (Barb Guy)

Amy Williamson is not able to attend but she will be here in the Fall.

Model:

Use results and other data to provide different levels of supports to districts and AEAs based on what they need for a continuous improvement process. Starts with Healthy Indicators

Starting next year with Universal Instruction & Assessment and Data-Based Decision Making. For next year, this only applies to PK-6 Literacy

3 areas considered to determine levels of support:

1. Compliance
2. Assessment and data-based decision-making

3. Universal instruction

Healthy Indicators (*see slide*) blue shaded are optional; bolded – required by legislation to be included; black are those that the group working on healthy indicators think are important. These will all be reviewed by the group and it will be decided how they fit into the model. Healthy indicators are just one of the things considered in the levels of support.

Assessment:

To determine healthy indicators, look at: 1. Percent of students assessed with a valid and reliable universal screener; 2. Percent of students not meeting benchmark assessed with a valid and reliable progress monitoring assessment.

5 year cycle no longer exists

Pilot for 2015-16--48 volunteer districts, AEA, nonpublics and pre-k

Identify 10-15 districts that need targeted support (desk audit and phone interview) and 8-12 that need intensive support (site visit). Intensive support could only be needed in one area.

Volunteers will be assigned to the support levels based on the cut scores in Healthy Indicators. The cut points will be the “ideal state”. Actual cut points for support will be determined based on Spring 2015 data and the capacity to serve

IDEA Compliance:

Will keep secondary transition (B13) as is for the next year- remainder of the process is currently in design

Group Activity:

- Q.** What are the 3-5 most essential elements of IDEA that are most closely relate to improving educational results for children with disabilities?
- a. Child Find/Eligibility
 - b. Parent involvement & engagement
 - c. Student involvement
 - d. Reasonable and appropriate goals that allow for a year’s growth in year’s time
 - e. SDI
 - f. Transition
 - g. Least Restrictive Environment
 - h. Progress Monitoring

Member Selection Committee:

Kurtis Broeg, Susie Lund, Jason Yessak, Donita Dettmer, Margaret Ebersold

Motion: Kelly made motion to accept the committee’s membership recommendations, Amy Liddell second the motion to approve.

Motion was approved

Vice-Chair:

Craig Barnum was elected as Vice Chair

Updates:

SDI – taking proposal to the directors and will move forward in the fall (Barb)

IEP – Will be meeting this June to articulate the deliverables and the timeline for implementation. (Barb)
Beth Rydberg mentioned there was some new coding on the IEP that was confusing. Beth will find out what specifically the codes were and notify Barb.

ChildFind – Karen has submitted a proposal to present at OSEP conference. Looking for a new collaborative project since the modules were successful. There is a survey to track the number of viewers. (Beth Rydberg reported). Mary Stevens agreed to put dissemination of the modules on the agenda for the next Directors meeting.

Intensification of Literacy Instruction—Sarah Brown and Greg Feldmann

As part of the collaborative work with c42k we have been working on early literacy.

Looking at supplemental and intensive interventions

Aligned with SDI work- overlap of members between the two groups

We are moving towards one system where we are able to meet the needs of all students; students with disabilities are just a part of the system.

Overlap between the practice of MTSS and the law of Chapter 62

MTSS	Chapter 62
Strong core instruction	Universal screening
Universal screening	Early intervention
Early intervention	Progress monitoring
Progress monitoring	Summer school
Data-based decision making	Retention

Task team was put together to put together a guide for Phase 1 (pilot) schools. The audience for the guide is MTSS Phase 1 schools: building level teams and instructional coaches. With all of the MTSS work- we

put together a collaborative inquiry process to know what questions to ask (instead of telling them what they should do). Questions address both the system level and the individual level.

The MTSS pyramid is about resources (not learners). Resources can include: instructional strategies, group size, staff, time, materials etc.

Which students are successful with the resources we provide at the universal tier?

Which students need additional/different resources?

Which students need intensive instruction?

Support is about layers...adding layers for those that need additional supports (universal, targeted, intensive).

Belief behind the guide: All children can learn to read:

- When a learner isn't successful- intensify the instruction
- Use data-informed decisions – it isn't about the learner but it is about the instruction
- Focus on high-leverage variables- focus on what has been shown to increase the trajectory
- Prioritize fidelity and evidence-based practice- if I don't see changes in what I am monitoring, why? Do fidelity checks throughout
- Curriculum and Instruction matter- focus on more than the skill deficits of the learner

Facilitation Guide:

Designed to be implemented by teams that are determining individual student needs: grade level teams, PLCs, Others

Provides the collaborative inquiry steps to follow to meet individual student needs.

Adjourn: Motion to adjourn: Kelly Von Lehmden

Second the Motion: Mary Stevens

Next meeting is scheduled Friday, September 11, 2015 at the Grimes State Office Building