Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel
November 18, 2022

Present: Joy Barlean, Cynthia Blackard, Dawn Bonsall, Casey Force, Shannon Grundmeier, Rhonda Haitz, Jessica Iverson, Lori Janke, Pam Litterer, Amy Llewelyn, Lee Longmire, Kim Neal, Keri Osterhaus, Tammy Schaapherder, Lisa Shaw, Rachel Terry, Joel Weeks, and Doug Wolfe.

Zoom: Jennifer Aldrich, Mary Jackson, and Sonia Reyes

Absent: Jennifer Anderson, Johnna Deaton-Davis, Genevieve Hart, Tami Hoffman, Amy Knupp, Bryan Paulson, Sandra Smith, Karen Thomson, and Rebecca Torres.

Department Staff Present: Barb Guy, Nancy Hunt and Beth Buehler-Sapp

Presenters: Barb Guy, Iowa Department of Education

Public Comment: None

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Minutes from 10/14/22 meeting

Welcome/Introductions
The meeting was called to order by Jessica Iverson, Chair at 9:05 a.m. Introductions were made around the room.

Minutes were reviewed by the panel members. Lori Janke made a motion to approve the minutes. Rachel Terry seconded the motion. A vote was taken with no abstentions and the minutes were approved.

Differentiated Accountability – IDEA – Barb Guy
[Slide Deck](#)

Barb Guy presented on Differentiated Accountability for IDEA.

Barb provided background on General Supervision and the responsibility of the Department and the Differentiated Accountability process with an IDEA focus. Other topics included:
- Implementation of Support Rubric
- Overview of Accountability Model
- Process for Assigning Support Levels

IDEA-DA Focus Areas:

The current work toward IDEA-DA is based on the work that was defined by an internal team in 2017. The team worked to identify data elements that aligned with the promises of IDEA. The below depicts the organization of the outcomes into focus areas:

Focus Area: Secondary Transition	Focus Area: Child Find	Focus Area: Academic Success	Focus Area: Social Emotional Behavior
• Secondary Transition Outcomes • Graduation rates • Drop Out rates • Transition	• Child Find • Disproportionate Representation	• Statewide Assessments Participation & Outcomes • Early Childhood (3-5) Environments LRE Placement • Preschool Outcomes • School-Age (6-12) Environment LRE Placement	• Suspension & Expulsion • Preschool Social / Emotional Outcomes • Attendance

The Model:

- Most measures combine the three most recent years of available data; there are exceptions where only the most recent year of data will be used (e.g. Measure 4.2)
- A measure will not be used (will be redacted) for a district when there is data for fewer than five students
- The model utilizes measure weights
  - Each of the four focus areas makes up 25% of the total index weight
  - If a district has other non-redacted measures in the focus area, a redacted measure's weight is spread proportionally among those measure(s).
  - If a district has all measures within a focus area redacted, that focus area's weight is spread equally to the other three conceptual areas
- If a district does not have enough data for measures making up at least 50% of the total weight, that district will not receive a score.

Process for Identifying Support Levels:

Step 1: Identify Overall District Score (100 total)

- District's overall score comes from adding up the total points from each measure

- DE staff will individually review available data for district's with not enough data for measures making up at least 50% of the total weight will be individually reviewed by DE staff

Step 2: Identify Districts Support Levels

- The lowest 10% in the state will be identified to receive Tier 3 Supports

Step 3: Identify Supports for Directed Focus Area

- District measures that are in the bottom quartile of all districts will be reviewed
- These data will be used to identify a focused area of support.

Every district has an action plan; level of direction, accountability and support increases from Tier 1 to Tier 3. The Area of Support Tiers are as follows: select, recommend, and assign.

There are two ways in which the data can lead to supports:

1. Universal desk audit data are those data that districts/schools are accountable to submit annually that help us understand district/school compliance and possible system needs in law or specific programs.
2. Other data, like complaints or incidents that require immediate action that we must attend to as a state education agency

Any one of these doors could determine that a district or school needs support at the Tier 2 or 3 levels.

Regardless of which data leads us to say supports needed here, there is a Data Review either within a directed team or a system team. The data is reviewed to determine what kind of team composition is optimal. See below for definitions of Directed and System.

- **Directed-**. a directed team works directly with a district or a school for a predetermined purpose. The focus of the purpose is based on a preponderance of complaints, non-compliance, incidents that require immediate action or otherwise an indication of the need for dedicated and directed support to understand and address critical circumstances. Team membership is exclusively governmental agency personnel.
- **System-**. a system team works with district and/or school leadership teams on implementing and sustaining continuous improvement practices to improve system and student outcomes. Team membership includes IDOE and AEA personnel, and as the work unfolds, district/school leadership teams in the active implementation of continuous improvement.

Districts will be notified of their data will be released through CASA in November. Notification will include the district score on ISR, assigned tier and focus area. AEA Special Education Directors will receive a spreadsheet of district support level assignments.

In 2022-23, there will be a guided data review for Tier 3, the customization of SDI literacy packages, and the development of SDI Secondary Transition packages,

 Barb will be able to share data with you at the next SEAP meeting.

Questions/Comments from Council Members:

Doug Wolfe – Do you anticipate a district questioning the data?
Barb Guy – That's always foreseeable.

Kim Neal talked about how cultural differences can present a challenge when addressing attendance issues based on beliefs and norms.

Jessica Iverson asked which 3 years of data were used?
Barb Guy said the 3 schoolyears used were 18-19, 20-21, and 21-22. The 19-20 was not used due to COVID disruption.

Kim Neal made the point that just because districts are still on this list doesn't mean they haven't made improvement/growth.

Barb Guy said, OSEP (Office of Special Education Programs) does require us to set determination. Our compliance data are very high and our results data are very low.

Priority Setting – Barb Guy

In the 2013-2021 there were 2 priorities in the SPP (State Performance Plan) which were as follows:

- Replenish Instruction
    - Accomplishments
        - Collaboration with General Education MTSS Work
        - SDI Framework
        - SDI Early Literacy Districts
- Simplify Systems

    - Accomplishments:
        - i3 (iowaideainformation.org)
        - ACHIEVE
        - Strengthening infrastructure supports

Priorities for the current SPP (State Performance Plan) for 2022-2027 are as follows:
- Renew Data Driven Culture
- Enhance Personnel for Delivery of Quality Services and Supports

Actions:
- Mental Health of students
- Safety in Public Schools
- Achieve Parent Access/Portal
- Staff Shortages and unmet needs due to shortage (parent perspective)-
- Children being taken care of by relatives (kin caregivers)
- SPP
- Keep the main thing the main thing

Discussion of the priorities:

Renew Data Driven Culture:

- Parent portal

- Support parents to understand how/why progress monitor

- ACHIEVE provides tools in a timely manner

- ACHIEVE helpful for AEA and other partners to collaborate using data

- Importance of adding comments to progress monitoring

- Would be nice to hover over a score to understand the data- proactive description of meaning

- Where is the student in understanding progress monitoring- finding a way to summarize after the fact if not part of the meeting.

- DLM - access to aggregate data

Enhance Personnel for Delivery of Quality Services and Supports:

Personnel-Teacher Retention

Long term

- apprenticeships

Triage

- Supports in buildings for teacher well-being
- Incentives for
  - Higher wages for associates
  - Required training for associates
  - Pay scale responsive to training
- Specialized training for paras that is relevant to work (align with incentives)
- Exit interviews
- Data on wage comparisons
- Data on entry to preservice and why people don't complete
- Increased planning time for teachers

ACHIEVE – Amy Alfrey

Amy gave an update on ACHIEVE.

Phase 1 – Development and Implementation will be fixed.
Phase 2 – Development
- SEAP
- Family Stakeholder Group
- Govt. Group

Parent Engagement Survey will now sit in ACHIEVE.

Amy asked for feedback on a document "Preparing for an ACHIEVE IEP Meeting" from the Panel. The document went through section descriptions and optional sentence starters for areas such as strengths and skills; preferences and interests; consideration of special factors (i.e., accessible education materials, assistive technology, communication, English learner, health, hearing, social emotional behavior, and vision.); involvement and progress in general education; goal development, progress monitoring and reporting progress to families; services, activities and supports.

Progress can be followed on the ACHIEVE public Google Site.

Announcements

Barb Guy – There are leftover binders and thumb-drives from the 2022 Annual Iowa Special Education Conference on the table.

Joel Weeks made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Casey Force seconded the motion. There were no abstentions and the meeting was adjourned at 2:15pm.

Next SEAP meeting is Friday, January 13, 2023
9:00 a.m.–3:00 p.m.
Grimes State Office Building, Room B100