

# Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

**Date:** November 7, 2018

**Members Present:** Sam Blazina, Marta Bloomquist, Jeff Brown, Sarah Butcher, Jen Cole, Gail Coulter, Shawnta DiFalco, Lou Oma Durand, Darya Farivar, Kathleen Harvey, Robb St. Lawrence (filling in for Rob Hines), Tammie Jensen-Tabor, Dominic Jimenez, Sherry Krainick, Jennifer Lee, Kim Leger, Diana Marker, Sean McCormick, Michele Smith, Laurie Thomas, Vanessa Tucker

**Excused Absences:** Carrie Fannin, Rob Hines

**OSPI Staff:** Glenna Gallo, Bev Mitchell, Sandy Grummick, Mary Ellen Parrish, Lee Collyer

**Guest Presenters:** Corine Pennington, Gavin Hottman, JoLyn Berge

**Guests:** Representative from League of Education Voters

**Note Taker:** Bev Mitchell

| Topic  | Discussion   | Action  | Who/When | When   |
|--|--|---|----------|--|
| <b>Call meeting to order</b>   | Sarah Butcher called the meeting to order<br><br>Introduction of members.<br>Public participation guidelines read<br><br>Reviewed and accepted minutes from July, 2018 meeting.  | N/A   |          | July, 2018 minutes posted on OSPI/SEAC webpage 11/21/18                          |
| <b>Membership vacancies</b>  | Will address at February meeting.  |   |          | Added to 2/19 SEAC meeting agenda  |
| <b>Special Education in Washington (APR, OSPI Priorities, and OSPI Special Education Related Legislative Budget Requests)<br/>Sandy Grummick and Glenna Gallo (WA State APR SWD)</b> | Do we want to look at data? See what other states are using and ask parents for recommendations. Group discussion was good and the members had good questions. Sandy answered questions and drew the group together by engaging in discussion with them. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEAC approved new targets for Indicator 1, in alignment with the state ESSA plan</li> <li>SEAC approved lowering of the target for indicator 4A to 4%</li> <li>SEAC approved increasing the target for indicator 5A to 60%</li> <li>SEAC approved feedback for the proposed special education tiered multiplier</li> </ul> |          | Targets amended on the APR, to be submitted 2/1/19<br><br>SEAC input provided as |
| <b>Safety Net WAC (392-140-</b>  |  |   |          |  |

| Topic  | Discussion  | Action   | Who/When | When                                    |
|--|---|--|----------|---|
| <p><b>600 through 685) (20 min, 10:45-11:05) – Glenna Gallo</b></p> <p><b>(OSPI Decision Packages &amp; WAC 392-140-600 through 685)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about when parents refuse to consent to Medicaid billing or districts have unlicensed personnel who can't apply for Medicaid. Clarify rule 392-140-60120, districts shouldn't be penalized if parents refuse.</li> <li>• Questions about how Medicaid deduction would be calculated. What is past practice with this? Someone said there has been a standard deduction of about \$500.00. Should just be the IDEA Medicaid, for no supplanting. Does State Auditors Office need to be included in this discussion?</li> <li>• Questions about reimbursement for transportation, especially in charter schools.</li> <li>• Proposed input: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Appreciated the inclusion of institutional education students.</li> <li>○ The workgroup put in so much work. Appreciated the recommendations released in August, with the removal of the IDEA funds and the thresh hold from Safety Net.</li> <li>○ Support reduction of IEP review, to a sample, to reduce district administrative review time prior to submission. Reliance on monitoring for compliance, and agree that compliance is necessary.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEAC approved a statement providing feedback on the Safety Net WAC changes</li> </ul> |          | <p>part of WAC public comment 11/19</p> |

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p><b>NCEO Report on Graduation Pathways and Assessment Participation for WA Students with Disabilities – Mike Middleton (NCEO Report on Graduation Pathways)</b></p> | <p><b>What is OSPI Pursuing?</b></p> <p><b>Purpose of NCEO Technical Assistance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connect several interrelated factors believed to be contributing to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced participation in the regular pathway to graduation</li> <li>• Increased participation in the alternate assessment</li> <li>• Overall reduced participation in the state assessment system by students with disabilities (particularly at high school)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Work with stakeholders to discuss challenges, opportunities, and approaches to address these interrelated factors and expectations for students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Create materials that provide guidance to districts in promoting high expectations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Purpose of Data Analyses</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased participation of students with disabilities in the regular graduation pathway (i.e., Certificate of Academic Achievement (CAA) rather than through the Certificate of Individual Achievement (CIA))</li> <li>2. Decreased participation of students with disabilities in the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS)</li> <li>3. Increased overall participation of students with disabilities in the grade-level state assessment system</li> </ol> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sarah Butcher made a motion regarding Graduation Pathways for Students with Disabilities. SEAC approved a statement providing feedback on Graduation Pathways.</li> <li>• OSPI will be providing the data to the school districts.</li> </ul> |  | <p>SEAC statement provided to Mike Middleton, OSPI Assessment 11/19</p> |
|---|--|--|--|---|

|   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | <p><b>Graduation Pathway Analyses for 2016-17</b><br/> Washington provides multiple pathways to graduation for all students , including several options exclusively for students with disabilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Only about one-fourth of students with disabilities earned a diploma by taking the required regular state tests or one of the CAA options</li> <li>B. The majority of students with disabilities earn a CIA for graduation (~60% for math; ~57% for ELA)<br/> <i>Recall - Proficiency on the WA-AIM results in a CIA</i></li> <li>C. The most frequently used options were off-grade-level assessments, the regular test, and the “basic” level of the regular test for ELA</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Panel on special Education Funding—Mary Ellen Parrish, OSPI; Corine Pennington, Puyallup SD; Jeff Brown, Burlington-Edison SD; JoLynn Berge, Seattle PS; Gavin Hottman, ESD 112</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Do you believe that funding based on an amount of service would cause district personnel to change or revise IEPs?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The funding model in itself, wouldn't increase pressure from current levels, as there is constant pressure to do more. This is a current struggle. Special education is not a money making operation.</li> <li>○ Other variable in this is that it will require leaders in the special education programs to look at needed adjustments to current service models. The general education and special education teachers would not be impacted in their decision making.</li> <li>○ Students receiving one hour or less a week are generally receiving therapy services, and the ESAs providing those</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>services aren't going to look at increasing those substantially or driving those increases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not the model, but a concern about a creep in eligibility with the removal of the 13.5% cap.</li> <li>● <b>When you ran your district numbers, did it address the funding gap in which you are using levy funds?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The root causes for the gap are larger than our funding mechanism, but this is a step in the right direction.</li> <li>○ I like the idea of a multi-tiered model. I recognize that this is a draft and provides some, but not all, yet.</li> <li>○ I like that it addresses the individual services.</li> <li>○ For Seattle, it doesn't address the entire gap yet, and may not due to the increased salary costs.</li> <li>○ For ESD 112, there is a negative in the first biennium, which turns positive in the second biennium. The first model, had a greater impact, then this model, which spaces it out through 6 years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>What modifications do you recommend to this model?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It needs to happen all at once, rather than over six years.</li> <li>○ Any program that addresses K-12 is going to be expensive, but we need to show the need, all at once.</li> <li>○ We are in a situation of a total reform of the levy system</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The variables within the driver that should be reviewed is the use of supplementary aids and services.</li> <li>○ The 3121 allocation, dollars follow a student with disabilities going into the general education classroom. This multiplier increase is positive, but the 3121 dollars will shift from a special education to a general education allocation, which may result in them being used differently by the district (to staff for basic education in elementary, and by period in the general education). These are Basic Education dollars.</li> <li>○ The model doesn't allow for concurrent minutes (behavior support during academic instruction, or related services at same time).</li> <li>○ IEP Online doesn't have a report for the data needed to calculate the total hours.</li> <li>○ Will it decrease the district's reliance on local levy and fully fund special education? Addressing the gap may not result in fully funding special education.</li> <li>● <b>How do districts need to be staffed to provide an inclusive program? Can this be addressed within the prototypical model? How do we support a system in which the experts work directly with students (academically and socially)?</b></li> </ul> |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Information gathering from Partner Agencies and SEAC members, including committee updates</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sherry Krainick (Washington State Parent Teacher Association–PTA) shared about the Washington PTA 2019 legislative platforms– Social Emotional Learning; Special Education funding; Improving outcomes in Special Education.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jennifer Cole (Partnerships for Action, Voices of Empowerment–PAVE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PAVE participating in the Family Youth System Roundtable Partner meetings. 67% of students receiving the Wraparound (WISe) support services have IEPs.</li> <li>○ Interim report for the <a href="#">Regional Behavioral Health Pilot Project Update Children’s Mental Health Workgroup</a>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Tammie Jensen-Tabor–(ESD 113) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ESD 113 is concerned that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find qualified interpreters.</li> <li>○ Desire is to have students with disabilities not in general education classrooms because of safety reasons and the parents being afraid that their student will be expelled because of the safety focus that is going on.</li> <li>○ <a href="#">Treehouse</a> (advocacy group) has reached down into Thurston County.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Kathleen Harvey (Department of Social and Health Services–DSHS, Juvenile Justice) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The agency is joining DCYF.</li> <li>○ Juvenile Justice has changed its footprint from last year’s legislative session. Senate Bill 6160 has expanded juvenile jurisdiction to the age of 25 in recognition of adolescent brain development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Darya Farivar (Disabilities Rights Washington–DRW) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Self-advocacy for transition age youth.</li> <li>○ DRW is looking at adding a priority around special education funding.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Diana Marker (Washington Charter School Association) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 12 charter schools operating in the state, each school is its own LEA. They are serving approximately 15.2% of students with disabilities.</li> <li>○ State Supreme Court ruled that charter schools are constitutional.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Laurie Thomas (Department of Early Learning/Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF)) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The agency is transitioning to DCYF and asking for patience as they make this transition.</li> <li>○ Receiving support from the Pyramid Model.</li> <li>○ Technical Assistance from Early Childhood Personnel Center in Connecticut. One of the top priorities is qualified staff.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Vanessa Tucker (Pacific Lutheran University) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Great candidates for special education endorsement.</li> <li>○ Opportunity at ESD 113 – ESD is looking into creating a school by September 2019 for students who would typically go to an</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | Non-Public Agency (NPA) could go to this alternative instead. Based on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS).  |   |  |  |
| <b>Washington Due Process hearing decisions between July, 2018 and November, 2018 – Glenna Gallo</b>   | <a href="#">IDEA Due Process Hearing Decisions</a>   |   |  |  |
| <b>Discussion regarding input received during the community reception on November 6 – Sarah Butcher</b>  | See the minutes from the community forum.  |   |  |  |
| <p><b>Update on the 35 districts and entities that had not reported or were missing items of their restraint and isolation data from 2016-17 as of July 2018.</b></p> <p><b>If any of the 35 districts still have not reported their data from 2016-17, what are the barriers? Consequences? Report on recommendations regarding the quality of the data and the upcoming data reporting. What changes are being made? Discussion anticipated on the above items – Lee Collyer (Restraint and Isolation)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beyond reporting fixes, school staff need to know how to do it, and report it correctly.</li> <li>• The SEAC members report that some schools feel that students with an IEP or Emergency Response Protocol (ERP) are exempt from this reporting.</li> <li>• OSPI considering changes to data collection, including collecting student level data. Next meeting of Data Governance Committee at OSPI is in December.</li> <li>• Trauma informed practices needed to address the overuse of restraint, as well as the use of prevention (e.g., PBIS)</li> <li>• Kudos to new OSPI disciplinary rules, which is a step forward.</li> <li>• Need to move from reactive to proactive, with interim plans to address behavioral needs safely with the least impact to the education of students.</li> <li>• Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (WACTE) is interested in embedding trauma informed practices and</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Laurie Thomas made a Motion and it was seconded that SEAC forms a committee to draft a position paper on positive behavior supports in schools.</li> <li>○ Discussion: Does that limit it? Trauma-informed MTSS to ensure all pieces are included. Adverse childhood experiences (ACES) are great, but the informed practice based on ACES that are critical. Consider expanding the motion to provide the committee flexibility to review research and suggest action.</li> <li>○ Motion amended and seconded: Glenna Gallo made motion that SEAC create a committee focused on positive behavior supports</li> </ul> |  |  |

|                       |   |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
|                       | <p>Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) in their teacher prep programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can SEAC generate a resource bank for consultants who can support Professional Development within LEAs, including planning for facilities changes to support students?</li> <li>• How do we build the capacity of communities, since schools cannot do this alone?</li> </ul> | <p>and methods to reduce restraint and isolation in schools through a white paper. Motion passes unanimously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Leadership of committee is Vanessa Tucker</li> <li>▪ Committee members: Jennifer Lee, Sam Blazina, Tammie Jensen-Tabor, Kim Leger, Jeff Brown, Shawnta DiFalco</li> </ul> |  |  |
| <b>Public Comment</b> |   |  | <p>Mary Griffin gave public comment.</p> <p>Letter from Jim Strickland was read for public comment</p> |  |
| <b>Adjourned</b>      | <p>Sarah Butcher adjourned the meeting at 4:00p.m.</p>  |  |  |  |