<div style="border:1px solid black; text-align:center">**Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)**</div>

Date: October 9, 2019

Members Present: Sophie Apgar, Justin Bradford, Jeff Brown, Tanya Cochran, Jen Cole, Gail Coulter, Shyla DeJong, Tammie Doyle, Lou Oma Durand, Suzanne Ender, Patricia Gonzalez, Kathleen Harvey, Tammie Jensen-Tabor, Kitara Johnson, Jennifer Lee, Kim Leger, Diana Marker, Shanna McBride, Joy Sebe, Laurie Thomas, Vanessa Tucker

Excused Absences: Sam Blazina, Eden Bush, Shawnta DiFalco, Syreeta Jennings, Sean McCormick, Amie Verellen-Grubbs

OSPI Staff: Glenna Gallo, Beverly Mitchell

Guests: Debbie Hales – Lower Elwha Head Start, Abigail Westbrook, WSSDA, Jennifer Acuna – ESD 114, Shawnda Hicks - PAVE

Note Taker: Beverly Mitchell

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Called to Order				
➢ Call meeting to order ➢ Member and Public Introductions Public participation guidelines read				
➢ Icebreaker ➢ Review Agenda, Purpose of SEAC, Bylaws, Group Norms ➢ Review and accept minutes from August 2019 meeting	Everyone introduced themselves. Jeff Brown went over the agenda, the bylaws, and the group norms. Jen Cole went over the brochure, and what to expect at a SEAC meeting. Minutes from the August meeting were accepted.	Minutes were accepted with no changes and will be posted online.	Bev Mitchell will post them online.	Posted online 10/31/19

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed

➢ 2019-20 SEAC Goals – Executive Team	Worked on clarifying 2019-20 SEAC goals and formed workgroups per each of the four areas. Current focus areas that will be revised:
	Mental Health
	● Improving access to and coordination of services
	● Increasing use of Medicaid funding
	● Establishing strong early supports and strategies
	Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
	● Continuing work to define inclusion and build on what came out of our Community Meet and Greet Sessions
	● Identifying how SEAC can ensure its work helps to interrupt systemic racism, ableism, and oppression in our education system
	Equitable Access and Student Outcomes
	● Exploring multi-system involved youth with disabilities and identifying supports and changes needed
	● Identifying and elevating Local Education Agency (LEA) efforts to eliminate the use of restraint, isolation, and disproportionality in discipline
	Families as Partners
	● Supporting LEA SEAC development
	● Strengthening connections of local SEACs and organized parent groups to the state SEAC
		Workgroups formed for the four focus areas –
		
		Mental Health
		● Chair: Kim Leger
		  o Laurie Thomas
		  o Jenn Lee
		
		Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
		● Chair: Kitara Johnson
		  o Kathleen Harvey
		  o Patty Gonzalez
		  o Lou Oma Durand
		  o Gail Coulter
		
		Equitable Access and Student Outcomes
		● Chair: Justin Bradford
		  o Tanya Cochran
		  o Vanessa Tucker
		  o Shyla DeJong
		  o Shanna McBride
		  o Sophie Apgar
		
		Families as Partners
		● Chair: Joy Sebe
		● Co-Chair: Jen Cole
		  o Tammie Doyle		

➢ Discussion about coordinating a combined meeting with the SEAC and the State	Having the connection with the early childhood piece by having a joint meeting with the Statewide Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and SEAC would be beneficial to both	The SEAC indicated interest in working the SICC for a virtual option to participate in the meeting.	Jen Cole will reach out to the SICC to coordinate.	

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) – Executive Team ➢ Select committee chair for Legislative Policy Workgroup – Jeff Brown	councils. Jen Cole sits on the SICC to represent SEAC. There is a possibility of coordinating a few hours and/or Zoom. Diana Marker agreed to the position of chairing the Legislative Policy.	**Legislative Policy Workgroup** • Chair: Diana Marker o Tanya Cochran o Suzanne Ender		
➢ Restraint and Isolation Update – Glenna Gallo	➢ Use of restraint over property damage is a concern, as some staff believe restraint is appropriate for destruction of a bulletin board. ➢ CEDARS data collection: who will enter the data? Some teachers are not documenting the use of isolation and restraint. ➢ Would the state mandate the use of one de-escalation program? ➢ Timeline should align with civil rights data collection, which has a structure in place. Asking for Legislative assistance to change timeline for the data reporting. ➢ Prohibiting the use of floor restraint is a topic Superintendent Reykdal is concerned with and interested in what the SEAC has to say. ➢ This connects with SEAC goals, especially in increasing behavioral health services and training for general education teachers. ➢ Many implications for teacher preparation programs for both general and special education teachers. We need to find ways for this to happen, as it is critically important. ➢ Consider the needs of youth with multiple needs, including substance abuse, behavioral needs. Can there by provisions for safety of teachers and staff for youth with significant needs?	Glenna Gallo requested a statement from the SEAC on their requests. Also, to acknowledge the support of the legislature provided and funding, and the training and changes that have happened. To draw the connection between "this is the funding that was needed to provide support and this is what happened after getting what was needed."		

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	➢ When we have students with explosive behavior, we need to consider the need for Behavior Intervention Plans, which address the function of the behavior. For any student. ➢ Training of micro-aggressions and institutional racism for all school staff, to see to whom the restraints and isolation is being applied to. ➢ Concerns that general education students who are being isolated and restrained and not reported. ➢ Updated and modified the website. ➢ Manual is planned for the spring which will be available for school districts, a workgroup to review the manual, develop a resource page around reduction, crisis intervention protocol, and a review of data collection from 2018-19. ➢ Defining restraint and isolation. ➢ Requests for a standardized form from OSPI to assist in collection and reporting of data.			
➢ Safety Net Process Results 2018-19 and Changes for 2019-20	➢ To receive Safety Net funding, a district must demonstrate capacity – you must spend more money than you received. ➢ Additional Safety Net funds were received from the Legislature. $71 million of state Safety Net funding and $14.7 million federal Safety Net funding. ➢ Two types of applications can be submitted: High needs individuals – student specific. Community impact – district can apply if they have factors that cause them to have a higher number of students with disabilities with some particular characteristics within their district that causes them to have increased costs.	Share the Safety Net Survey Legislative Report with SEAC when completed and add to next agenda. OSPI Reports to the Legislature web page Reentry and communication plan for use with NPA, as well as partnerships with parents and NPAs.		

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	➢ The Safety Net application process is now electronic instead of mailing a hard copy and removing the redaction process which saves a great deal of time. ➢ Increased the training for Safety Net. ➢ Districts may want to determine Extended School Year (ESY) needs following winter break, rather than spring break. ➢ Including High School and Beyond Plans (HSBP) in Safety Net IEP review. ➢ Use of Non-Public Agency (NPA), and concerns, will be in the annual Safety Net Survey Legislative report in December 2019. ➢ RCW requires to reduce a Safety Net award if the district decides not to use Medicaid services. This has not been implemented. But starting in 2019-20, districts must submit either evidence of Medicaid billing when it's appropriate or take a reduction in the districts award. If the districts can provide evidence that their reasons are valid for not utilizing Medicaid services, then they do not take a reduction. ➢ Safety Net webpage ➢ Bulletin No. 070-19 Special Education Safety Net Application for 2019-20			
➢ OSPI Supplemental Legislative Requests for 2020 (15 min) OSPI Legislative Priorities 2020 OSPI Legislative Requests: 1. OSPI 2020 Supplemental Operating Budget	Glenna Gallo summarized the OSPI Supplemental Legislative Requests for 2020.			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Requests 2. Special Education Multiplier Increase 3. Increased Supports for Beginning Educators (Including Special Educators) 4. Staffing Enrichment Workgroup Recommendations 5. Implementation of Statewide Early Screening for Dyslexia 6. Funding for Required Paraeducator Professional Learning 7. Student Teacher Residency Technical Advisory Group 8. Increased Equity in School Nursing Services				
➢ Acknowledgement of Appointment of Joy Sebe, Open Doors for Multi-Cultural Families as a member of the ESHB 1130 OSPI Language Access Workgroup representing the SEAC	OSPI Special Education Monthly Update – September 2019 page 4 speaks to specific requirements for students with an IEP. Recognizing the language needs of parents of students eligible for special education services within ESHB 1130. Jen Cole is also part of the ESHB 1130 OSPI Language Access Workgroup in a different role.			
➢ Due Process	Discussed delays in due process hearing decisions and recent increase in state	Helpful to make Procedural Safeguards easier to understand. Member asked if anyone has a "cliff notes" simplified		

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	complaints, and concerns from parents about data on their child's progress. OSPI is requesting assistance in supporting families to address concerns within the local system, as well as through IDEA dispute resolution options. Members spoke in favor of options that support partnerships between parents and districts. This connects with SEAC goals.	version with plain speak that can also be provided with the Procedural Safeguards.		

➢ Graduation Pathways Discussion
➢ State Board of Education Proposed Rule Changes to 180-51-001 through 180-51-115 (see pgs 80-81)
	➢ Impact of school schedules, historical practices with IEP decisions, culture, determining service minutes
	➢ Request for disaggregated graduation data by disability, post-school outcomes
	➢ What are the expectations that are being provided to students and are the districts providing the supports to reach those expectations?
	➢ Increasing access and outcomes:
	   ▪ Foster collaboration between general & special education and community partners
	   ▪ Build a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)
	      ▪ Framework of tiered interventions & supports
	      ▪ Data-informed (culturally-responsive) pre-referral interventions
	   ▪ Mindset matters
	      ▪ Strengths-based framing: focus on what students CAN do			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	▪ All students are capable of achieving with the right supports ▪ Addressing structural inequality must be part of the discussion ➢ This is an all-education priority			
➢ Legislative Policy committee ➢ PBIS Committee ➢ Inclusion Committee, including definition	No update reports from these workgroups.	They will meet prior to the next SEAC meeting and report at that time.		
➢ Overview of Inclusionary Practices project (30 min)	The Inclusionary Practices Professional Development Project—$25,000,000 funded through the 2019–2021 biennial budget—will emphasize professional development in support of inclusionary practices will focus on coaching and mentoring classroom teachers on best practices for inclusive education, differentiated instruction, and culturally-responsive instruction. **Project Implementation & Timelines** **Fall 2019:** Notification of Pilot Schools; Statewide Project Orientation Webinar; and Funding application **Spring 2020:** Statewide professional development in support of inclusionary practices; Opportunities to visit and observe Demonstration Sites			
➢ Review letter from The ARC of King County and Others	Reviewed letter from the ARC of King County: written on behalf of Investing in Student Potential regarding use of funds to promote professional development of inclusionary practices for classroom teachers. Investing in			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	Student Potential is a coalition working to create a school system where "Every individual thrives in a learning-friendly environment where they feel safe, supported, and challenged." Prioritize: • Universal Design for Learning • Co-teaching • Fidelity in functional behavior assessments and individualized intensive behavior supports • Access needs of students in middle and high school across programmatic elements, including career and technical education and avenues to higher education Developmental relationships are critical, and exclusionary and segregated schools put students with significant disabilities and behavior support needs at a distinct disadvantage. All students should graduate feeling engaged and empowered and able to contribute to their communities. Investing in Student Potential Steering Committee: • The Arc of King County • League of Education Voters • Open Doors for Multicultural Families • Roots of Inclusion • Kevin Jacka, CEO, The Rural Alliance • Washington State Charter Schools Association			
➢ Definition of Inclusion Discussion	<mark>Requesting presentation from Gail Coulter.</mark> General education classroom and the community. Should not be based on cost-effectiveness, regardless how much it will cost	Glenna Gallo needs a definition immediately. She doesn't need the SEAC's definition immediately, but needs something. The SEAC will		

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	the district. General Education teachers, special education teachers, and para-educators should all be trained in the needs of the students. When defining inclusion should be mindful of the OSPI Equity Statement when writing definiton. **OSPI –Equity Statement** **Equity:** Each student, family, and community possesses strengths and cultural knowledge that benefits their peers, educators, and schools. Ensuring educational equity: • Goes beyond equality; it requires education leaders to examine the ways current policies and practices result in disparate outcomes for our students of color, students living in poverty, students receiving special education and English Learner services, students who identify as LGBTQ+, and highly mobile student populations. • Requires education leaders to develop an understanding of historical contexts; engage students, families, and community representatives as partners in decision-making; and actively dismantle systemic barriers, replacing them with policies and practices that ensure all students have access to the instruction and support they need to succeed in our schools.	continue working on getting a solid definition of inclusion. Glenna has asked that it be a priority.		

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	Visionary definition and operationalized definition. Providing all students with supports and services.			
➢ Public comment.	Jennifer Acuna – ESD 114 Shawnda Hicks – PAVE			
➢ Differentiated Monitoring and Support Engagement Decisions: *Washington* 2019-2020	OSEP's Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system is a component of Results Driven Accountability. DMS is designed to identify potential grantee risk to the Department and to assist OSEP in effectively using its resources to monitor grantees. DMS addresses State-specific needs in the areas of results, compliance, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and fiscal by differentiating levels and types of monitoring and support based on each State's unique strengths, progress, and challenges in each area. DMS is a multi-tiered model for monitoring and providing support based on the principle that supports are first provided at a core or universal level to effectively address the needs of all States. Targeted monitoring and support is generally based on OSEP's identification of common needs among multiple States. Intensive monitoring and support is reserved for those States with the most intense or complex challenges to implementation. OSEP has assessed States' and Entities' progress in meeting performance standards and compliance with the legal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards. This information was used to help OSEP make			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	decisions about a State's or Entities' levels of engagement for monitoring and support.			
➢ WA Open Public Meetings Act (RCW 42.30) Training	Trained the SEAC members in the Open Public Meetings Act Training. A presentation that was designed by the Washington State Attorney General's Office.			
➢ Summary of Actions	Workgroups and chairs were established. Community Forum expectations. Plans for the site visit on Thursday, October 10.			
Adjourned			Tammie Jensen-Tabor 4:30pm	10/09/19