

Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel

Date: April 12, 2019

Facilitator: Barb Guy

Panel Secretary: Beth Buehler-Sapp

Present: Jennifer Aldrich, Valerie Baker, Jessica Iverson, Bryan Sage, Rachel Terry, Cybthia Blackard, Pete Bunnell, Kate Cole, Doug Wolfe, Dawn Bonsall, Karen Thompson, Heather Brand, Kathleen Van Tol, Rachel Terry, Daniel Van Sant, Margaret Joan Ebersold, Elizabeth Hockey, David Van Horn, Ruth Frush, and Sandra Smith.

Department Staff Present: Barb Guy and Beth Buehler-Sapp.

Department Staff Absent: Nancy Ankeny Hunt

Absent: Shannon Tackes, Craig Barnum, Kate Cole, Kelly Ramus, Joel Weeks, Jodi Bonnett, Mary Jackson, Carma Betz, Susan Etschedit, Margaret Joan Ebersold, Christina McFadden, Wendy Parker, Helen Stevens, Erin Torruella, and Jason Yessak.

Presenters: Kathy Bertsch and Janell Brandhorst.

Public Comment: None

Handouts for the January 2019 meeting:

- [Agenda](#)
- Minutes from 2/15/19 meeting

Welcome/Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Kathleen VanTol at 9:00 a.m.

Approval of Consent Agenda

February minutes reviewed. No edits were made.

Motion made by Bryan Sage to approve, second by Karen Thompson. Motion approved.

Welcome Activity: Kathleen Van Tol

Eligibility and Evaluation Report – Kathy Bertsch

SEAP team members learned about work going on in collaboration between the IDOE and the AEAs to revise procedures for eligibility and provide guidance to AEA personnel who evaluate students for special education. The IDOE and AEA Directors of Special Education have developed a set of Questions and Answers around special education eligibility that was released across the year to AEA personnel through the AEA Special Education Directors.

The SEAP members broke into work-alike teams (family/parents, community partners, educators) and reviewed Questions and Answers related to Issue 2: Determining a Need for Special Education. Regarding this topic, teams shared:

- That it's important to consider if there is regression when interventions are removed.
- That an intervention can be part of the evaluation and teams should not wait if a disability is suspected.
- That special education is not a place and can be delivered by any educator as long as it's designed through special education.
- That educators should know the difference between general and special education and be able to explain it.
- That parents can support instructional decisions when there is open communication between families, general and special education teachers.
- That a Prior Written Notice is required if a parent requests an evaluation and it is decided that an evaluation for special education is not needed.

Teams also reviewed the 7 performance domains that must be considered during a full and individual evaluation for special education. They discussed how they can contribute information toward the evaluation. Parents indicated they could contribute information about their child's history, what works at home, what triggers problems and how their social relationships have been impacted. They can help strategize with schools about what works. Community partners indicated that they can bring a perspective regarding whether or not the concerns are typical or unique, how concerns impact a learner now and as adults and they can support evaluation teams by connecting schools and families with community resources. Lastly, educators shared the breadth of information that the general education teacher can bring to an evaluation including for example, comparison to peers, classroom expectations, strengths, weaknesses, observations and strategies that have been more/less successful.

The group reconvened to discuss various learning components which are part of the general and special education processes.

- RTI – Response to Intervention
- MTSS – Multi Tiered Systems of Support
- Evidence Based Practices
- Universal Instruction
- Eligibility Requirements
- Progress Monitoring
- Standards & Benchmarks

They group also talked about the aspects of having a disability and needing special education. A student can have a disability and need special education, however, they are not always congruent. A student who needs special education does not always have a disability and likewise not all students with disabilities require special education services.

There was brief discussion regarding Disability vs. Diagnosis. Not all students who have a diagnosis of an impairment have a disability that requires them to need special education services.

One instance is a student with a hearing loss impairment who might just require a

504 plan with some accommodations.

Does the student's condition affect their performance and need for instruction?

SDI – Specifically Designed Instruction has created a tremendous new element of special education.

Share out from group activity of roles – educators, family, and community partners.

Educators: Knowing the difference between general education and special education. We need to understand, know and be able to share out with everyone (teachers, parents).

Family: Need Open Communication. Communication between special education and general education teachers. Open with general education teacher/parent consistency. We don't always know what all of the acronyms mean.

Community Partners: Removal of RTI. Interventions and Evaluations at the same time.

Disability Suspected - Prior written notice is really important. Monitoring Tool. Parents should send emails as a written record including the date rather than relying on verbal communication. IDEA requires identification.

There are 7 performance domains. These should be used not only on the 1st time but on all re-evaluations to access criteria. Important for eligibility evaluation and adding new services. Interventions use prompts, cues, and reinforcements.

IEP/IFSP Update & Parent Portal Feedback – Janell Brandhorst

There is a new IEP data system being designed. After an extensive Request for Proposal (RFP), a contractor named SPEDSIS was chosen.

Some facets of the new IEP form/system:

- Now e-mailing an IEP has to have parental permission.
- Simple triggers for what to go/not do can be put in the system.
- More than one person can be working in the system at a time.
- Data when updated can import over into the IEP.
- Standardized Grading System, districtwide (cannot legislate statewide)

Pending Questions:

What types of things do we want access to?

- Access to everything, be able to give ideas, suggestions, and feedback to the process.

What does interactive look like to you as a family member?

- Being able to put data in and help students.

What security concerns do you have?

- Who has access, particularly when a court has ordered that someone cannot have access to that child.

What else would you like us to consider?

- All caseworkers (parties) working with a student that need access to a student's file.
- Definitions/Acronyms – parents are not knowledgeable about these.

- Notification or tickler system to see changes and make comments. (comments maybe shouldn't go out to all parties). Lots of people need to provide input but not everyone needs to see everything.

- How can corrections be made without changing the original document?
- Ability to electronically sign off on an IEP would be nice.
- Electronic communication on an IEP should be to all members everytime.
- Progress Monitoring Procedures as dictated.
- IEP Team determines when and how progress will be reported.
- Updates - New information is in there (different priorities)
- Quick way to log parent contact (tracking para, etc.)
- Behavior – log daily, post weekly
- For families without computer access – paper copies always available.
- 22 languages / make sure there is an interpreter, etc. available.
- How to filter access appropriately.
- Kids who have reached an age of majority.
- Reiterating history can be traumatic.
- We have to have flexibility for personal decision making.
- For example with courts, different levels of information available.
- Caution about infractions violating HIPPA by disclosing information in the parent portal that is confidential

Dispute Resolution Outreach and Family Support - Karen Thompson

Karen Thompson mentioned the Together we can conference. They always have Partners for this conference. You can find information about it on the ASK Resource Center website. There are 140 registrants already.

Davenport follow-up – regarding their issues with disproportionality and seclusion/restraint. There is a prominent minister from a local church involved in the mediation process. Both the families and the school district are working to seek cultural change and are working with a national administrator towards a resolution process.

The ASK Resource Center and a contractor have been working with a parent engagement survey. A total of 11,000 electronic surveys were sent out and between 1000 and 1100 responses have been received so far with 50% having reported bullying or harassment experiences. An assumption is that this is far more prevalent within the community than just within the school district.

The SEAP members received a handout entitled “RESPECT” (Recognizing Everyone's Strengths through Peace-Building, Empathizing, Communicating and Trust-building).

This team building training is being presented to all AEA's statewide in sessions broken down over a three year period from 2018-2021. It encompasses a 4 day long curricula. The hope is to make this a 2 day in-person and 2 day on-line option to make it more feasible for more persons to complete.

New SPP Indicators – Barb Guy

OSEP (Office of Special Education Programs) was reviewing the SPP indicators and that review was expected to be completed and SEAP were going to talk about but the review wasn't completed as expected. This will probably be on the May 2019 SEAP meeting agenda.

LRE Discussion

- Growing and spending most of their time with their peers in general education
- Instructional need
- Instructional materials
- Fidelity
- Measure reported for LRE is % of time with peers
- Goal – most value added environment
- Age vs. Grade vs. Development

Announcements

There are open positions on the SEAP panel. The Membership Application Deadline is April 19th, 2019. The on-line agenda for this meeting has an application link. A list of proposed meeting dates for the 2019-2020 schoolyear handout was given to members for review. These will be voted on at the May meeting for finalization.

Nominations for Vice-Chair for the group were requested and Cynthia Blackard volunteered. Currently Kathleen VanTol is the Chair and Elizabeth Hockey is the vice-chair. A vote for this will be taken at the next meeting on May 10th, 2019.

Future Agenda Items that would we would like to Discuss

None

Bryan Sage made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Elizabeth Hockey seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Next Meeting:

May 10, 2019

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Grimes State Office Building, B100

Facilitator: Barb Guy
Minutes: Beth Buehler-Sapp