

Washington State Special Education Advisory Council

October 7, 2015

Members Present: Andres Aguirre, Megan Bale, Sarah Butcher, Shari Cotes, Lou Oma Durand, Carrie Fannin, Cheryl Fernandez, Sherry Krainick, Jennifer Lee, Kimberly Leger, Rebecca Lockhart, Victoria McKinney, Ann Waybright

Excused Absences: Darci Ladwig

OSPI Staff: Valerie Arnold, Aubry Deaver, Doug Gill, Sandy Grummick, Scott Raub

Minutes Taken By: Aubry Deaver

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
Called to Order	Ann Waybright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02a.m.			
Member Introductions	New members are welcomed; returning members are welcomed back.			
Approval of May Meeting Minutes	May's meeting minutes were reviewed by members. It was moved by Lou Oma Durand and seconded by Andres Aguirre that the minutes be approved with corrections. Motion passed.	Make corrections and post May's meeting minutes to the OSPI Special Education website.	Aubry/ASAP	11/13/15
Review of October Agenda	The two-day agenda was reviewed with SEAC members. Members are urged to ask any questions about agenda items over the course of the meeting.			
New Member Information—SEAC Overview & Group Norms <i>Rebecca Lockhart and Ann Waybright</i>	The new members were provided information in individual binders, including the bylaws. There was discussion on the focus and function of the State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC).	Members requested an updated contact list. Meeting dates with locations for this year will be sent to all members.	Aubry/ASAP	10/12/15 1/21/16

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Group norms during and after meetings were reviewed with members. Members were encouraged to feel comfortable to ask questions and provide input.</p> <p>There was discussion on what attributes each member will bring to the council.</p>			
<p>Washington State Annual Performance Report (APR) and State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) <i>Valerie Arnold and Sandy Grummick</i></p>	<p>Sandy and Valerie provided an update on the Washington State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and the three-stage process that is part of a six-year plan (new Indicator B17) required by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Members were provided information about the federal determination for Washington State from the 2014–15 school year (Attachment #1), including the 17 performance indicators and an explanation for each of the state’s scores.</p> <p>Sandy and Valerie also discussed compliance indicators and the new processes in place since receiving the state’s determination from OSEP. The disparity between state and federal calculations on performance indicators was discussed together with the limitations on generalizing scores between states.</p> <p>Phase I of the SSIP (Indicator B17) was submitted on March 31, and Phase II is currently in the development stage (Attachment #2). Phase III implementation has also begun this school year. An evaluation plan is now required as part of Phase II to measure the impact of strategies implemented starting the 2015 school year.</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Theory of Action Plan: submitted as part of Phase I of the SSIP. As part of Phase II, an action plan for each of the four strands is submitted to build capacity at the regional, district, school and classroom level to influence impact on students.</p> <p>Questions were answered, and input was taken from members.</p>			
<p>State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) <i>Valerie Arnold Sandy Grummick and Sue Ann Bube</i></p>	<p>The Consistency Index (CI) enables congruency of student outcomes, starting with the Evaluation Review, IEP, and then Services designed and provided (Attachment #3). The higher the CI, the greater the likelihood of improved student outcomes. The CI uses several pieces of evidence to establish fidelity and efficiency. This system will have the ability to correlate post school outcomes. The analysis of the CI results should help districts focus on meaningful professional development activities.</p> <p>Sue Ann Bube gave an overview of new usability documents being programmed to help provide consistent data across reviewers: Student Dashboard (Attachment #4), Evaluation Protocol (Attachment#5), and IEP Review Protocols (Attachment #6). The consistency index helps guide implementation and provides a link to performance and compliance outcomes which can be applied to improving the delivery of services.</p>	<p>Provide the Parent Survey from the OSPI website to Victoria McKinney.</p>	<p>Valerie Arnold/ASAP</p>	<p>10/12/15</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Sue Ann also presented the online platform for the Consistency Index that enables the CI to be applied in any district. The platform is currently being programmed and tested; every protocol is also in the process of being completed.</p> <p>Questions from members were answered by the presenters.</p>			
<p>SEAC Input on Proposed Restraint and Isolation Regulations <i>Doug Gill</i></p>	<p>Members were given the revised Proposed Rule Making CR-102; including the new proposed and amended regulations relative to implementation of SHB 1240 (Attachment#7).</p> <p>Members reviewed the proposed rules and were given an opportunity to ask questions. Members were also encouraged share the proposed regulations, and to comment on the proposed rules either in writing and/or orally. The formal rules hearing is scheduled for November 12, 2015 at OSPI in Olympia.</p> <p>Comments can be submitted in writing by 5 p.m. on November 12, 2015; members can also come to the hearing and comment.</p>			
<p>Legislative and Special Education Monthly Update <i>Scott Raub</i></p>	<p>Scott described his role as Parent and Community Liaison at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) for new members, and shared some of his observations.</p> <p>Scott reviewed the Special Education Update from September (Attachment# 8).</p>			

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>Charter school representatives were at directors meetings; they're still open and serving students. Currently, there is no decision on the closure of charter schools. Federal IDEA funds have not been released. The King county Superior Court will issue a ruling in the near future.</p>			
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Susan Sturms is a parent of a child with a disability and Washington state Special Education Coalition president. Susan stated she attended the meeting to become familiar with the work of SEAC.</p> <p>Susan also commented and stated her observations related to SHB 1240:</p> <p>How clear it is in the regulations that the law's intended to apply to all students, not just students receiving special education services or on a 504 plan? Is it clear to directors and school districts that implementation needs to be looking at all students?</p> <p>In 1240: each district shall adopt a policy providing for the least amount of restraint or isolation to protect the safety of students and staff. District is supposed to develop a policy and is supposed to be reflected in the regulations anywhere; that intent in the law doesn't get lost.</p> <p>Anytime a student experiences restraint or isolation, the notification process is reflected for all students. Part of the law states that part of the follow up process is to identify training</p>	<p>Send a copy of Memorandum 050-15 on restraint or isolation to Susan Sturms.</p>	<p>Aubry/ASAP</p>	<p>10/9/15</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action	Who/When	Completed
	<p>or support the staff member needs to help the student avoid similar incident—this is not a provision that’s part of the notification procedures that are referenced in this part of the regional code of Washington. Part of identifying training needs to be included in regulations some place—not sure it got captured.</p> <p>Last section of HB 1240: reporting requirement that districts summarize use of isolation and restraint and report to OSPI and then OSPI is instructed to aggregate and publish reports. Is this supposed to be captured in somewhere in the regulations?</p> <p>Hopeful that in the next few years, the intent of the law is going to reduce incidents of use of restraint and devices.</p> <p>Susan was encouraged to submit written comment or come to the public hearing on SHB 1240 on November 12.</p> <p>Public comment from another individual was submitted by email (Attachment #9) and distributed to members in hard copy.</p>			
Adjourned	Adjourned the meeting at 4:22			