

**State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE)  
Meeting Minutes  
January 21, 2015 PSB Rm 251A/B, Salem, OR**

The advisory panel must—

- (a) Advise the SEA of unmet needs within the State in the education of children with disabilities;
- (b) Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities;
- (c) Advise the SEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618 of the Act;
- (d) Advise the SEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal monitoring reports under Part B of the Act; and
- (e) Advise the SEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. (Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1820-0030) (Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(21)(D))

	<b>Members:</b>	x	Leet, Angela		Stelzer, Catherine		<b>ODE:</b>
x	Acree, Susan	x	Middleton, Cindy	x	Swanson, Carrie		Hiaasen, Amanda
x	Barber, Valerie	x	Moore, Carol	x	Tempel, Gary		Wells, Jeremy
x	Baum, Liz	x	Ohlde, Jordan	x	Whitnah, Ruth		Drinkwater, Sarah
	Bendix, Renae	x	Ozols, Keith				
x	Colachico, Jennifer (Vice Chair)	x	Paul, Tammi (Chair)				
x	Connell, Beth		Powell, Shannon (Past Chair)				<b>Speakers:</b>
x	Dahill, Laura	x	Reinhart, Sean				Kruska, Mitch
x	Dunn, Roberta		Roberts-Frank, Alicia (Member at Large)			x	Franklin, Mike
x	Gordon, Erica	x	Schulte, Rebecca				
x	Hightower, Tracie	x	Smith, Julie				

<b>Agenda Item(s)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Welcome/ Introductions/ Updates for the Good of the Order	Tammi Paul, Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting at 9:09 a.m. Roundtable introductions of members and guests followed. New members, Laura Dahill and Cindy Middleton introduced themselves. Susan Acree, Carol Moore, Beth Connell and Elizabeth Baum attended the meeting remotely via GoToMeeting.
Approve Agenda & September Minutes	<b>Motion/Action:</b> <i>Tracie Hightower motioned to approve the January agenda. Keith Ozols seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.</i> <i>Roberta Dunn motioned to approve the September meeting minutes. Jennifer Colachico seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.</i>
Approve Annual Goals and the Public Policy Operating Procedures, SICC Appointee Vote	Carol Moore will be unable to attend the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meeting January 29 <sup>th</sup> and has requested someone fill in to provide feedback to SACSE. Roberta Dunn has colleagues on the SICC that can present a report to SACSE via a constituency report. Additionally, Carol Moore agreed to continue being the SICC representative from SACSE and the committee voted to approve her appointment. The committee reviewed the final drafts of the proposed goals for the 2015-2016 year.  <b>Motion/Action:</b> <i>Roberta Dunn motioned to approve the 2015-2016 Goals. Jordan Ohlde seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.</i>

**The Oregon Department of Education is an equal opportunity agency and employer.**

	<p><i>Jordan Ohlde motioned to approve Carol Moore as the SICC Appointee. Jennifer Colachico seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.</i></p> <p><i>Jennifer Colachico motioned to approve the Public Policy Operating Procedures. Jordan Ohlde seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.</i></p>
<p>May Meeting Location, TAESE Orientation</p>	<p>Discussion around the May meeting location ensued. Julie Smith recommended Pendleton which has a new Early Learning Center that could possibly host. No other geographical locations were presented; therefore the meeting will be in Pendleton and will start at 8:00 am and end at 3:00 pm due to travel time.</p> <p>Jeremy Wells presented an opportunity to the committee to have the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) team provide an orientation training specifically designed to train advisory councils. The training helps guide advisory councils to best assist the state. Tammi Paul shared that the Executive Committee had a conference with John Copenhaver, who would provide the training and believes it would be a positive training for the committee. Jeremy Wells mentioned that a room is already reserved for March 10<sup>th</sup>, which is the day before the next SACSE meeting, which would help minimize travel time for committee members who are traveling long distances to attend the meeting. A discussion ensued. The committee agreed to hold March 10, 2016 as the orientation training provided by TAESE.</p>
<p>(a) Dispute Resolution Committee Update</p>	<p>Mike Franklin, ODE, and Valerie Barber updated the committee on the Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC). Valerie is the SACSE representative on the DRC. The purpose of the DRC is to serve as a primary advisory group for ODE on special education dispute resolution matters. Dispute Resolution analyzes complaint data for trends and correlations. The committee was interested in seeing what data the DRC is analyzing and that it trickle down to organizations to ensure correlations are being looked at across all venues. Committee members commented on how hard it is for parents to get information regarding the option of using the DRC. Parents interested in more information can talk to Valerie. A discussion about how the data is recorded in the system ensued, including the idea that absenteeism may actually be a suspension recorded incorrectly.</p> <p>The committee stated that both general education and special education teachers need more resources and training pertaining on how to best help children in special education. The committee also requested data from dispute indicators, instructional minutes, and reduced or shortened days. Jeremy will talk with John English and Wes Mouw at ODE regarding additional data that could assist the committee in meeting the needs of students in Oregon.</p> <p>The committee would like more information regarding how much time a student in special education is in the general education and special education classrooms. The committee would like more information on what is going on in that classroom while the student is in it (ie. instructional time, educational assistant support, goals, occupational therapy, etc). The lack of information available to parents about what their student is learning/doing is an unmet need across the state and the committee wants to advise the state on how to best deliver the available information broadly.</p>
<p>System of Care and Wraparound Expansion</p>	<p>Angela Leet, Oregon Health Authority (OHA), presented information on the Oregon’s System of Care and Wraparound Expansion. ORS 418.975 to 418.985, Youth Wraparound Initiative states that “To the extent practicable within available resources, by the year 2015 partner agencies, individually and collectively, shall: implement and sustain the Wraparound initiative, ensure cultural competence in the provision of services, and collect and evaluate data”. Wraparound has been expanded to 14 of the 16 Coordinated Care organizations. Currently, Klamath County and parts of Central Oregon are not funded.</p> <p>Wraparound is a tool or a process used to implement interagency systems of care in achieving better outcomes for youth and their families. The process is similar to person centered planning and the individualized Positive Behavior Support planning process. Wrap around team meetings ensure all systems in which the youth is involved in are represented and is guided by the youth and family with a</p>

	<p>goal to create one plan and reduce confusion for the family. Involvement of the education system is critical because, besides the family, the schools know the students best and the schools often see issues occurring before other systems do.</p> <p>Communities have a lot of autonomy for how their wraparound plans are developed and implemented, making each one slightly different across the state. Additional information was requested by the committee pertaining to Wraparound guides and the organizations involved, and they were curious about how students in long term care and treatment programs fit into the system of care when their family advocates are often living long distances away from them. Angela will provide guides and a county map with contacts for wraparound Coordinated Care Organizations through Amanda to distribute to the committee. Many of the committee members thought that case studies of actual families and children utilizing wraparound resources would be a good way see how wraparound expansions are benefiting students with disabilities across the state.</p>
Committee & Constituent Reports	<p>Carol Moore shared a report about the November 20, 2015 SICC meeting. Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) no longer has a licensure for Early Childhood Education. The changes happened during the summer of 2015 and there was not much information or notice for public comment. The committee expressed concerns about the implications of the changes to licensure and requested information for how to submit complaints and concerns with the changes and the lack of transparency TSPC showed when making the changes in 2015. Alternatively, committee district representatives shared that removing some of the licensing barriers has helped them with hiring teachers that can be easily trained in house. It was suggested that EIECSE should be an optional endorsement. The March SACSE meeting is a joint SACSE/SICC meeting and the committee would like an agenda item pertaining to the TSPC changes.</p> <p>Valerie Barber shared what she is hearing in her area, Deschutes, as a parent. She has noticed an increase in shortened school days, particularly with students with disabilities. Valerie has attempted to contact the Department of Education to get clarification and has received broad answers that haven't helped her understand the legalities and rights of students. Often, the shortened days are discussed during the IEP meeting. Valerie is concerned that parents are signing IEPs without being fully aware of what they are actually signing. Schools need family partners. This topic started a discussion on how the committee can best use this information to advise the state.</p> <p>Julie shared a constituent report out of Eastern Oregon. The committee discussed how mental health treatment for students is a large unmet need especially in small districts. Sean Reinhart shared that in his district, Bend Lapine, they hired two mental health specialists to combat the lack of available resources for students with mental health needs..</p>
Public Comment & Lunch	<p>There was no Public Comment.</p>
(e) Extended Assessment	<p>Mitch Kruska updated the committee on the extended assessment. The extended assessment, known also as the alternate assessment, is for students being serviced with a modified curriculum. One of the key changes is in the new guidance for how the IEP teams identify students who are administered the alternate assessment. Mitch provided the committee with the new guidance document and went through the document with them.</p> <p>A discussion ensued about opting out and how parents are notified about this information. Additional opt out information can be received from Derek Brown in assessment at <a href="mailto:derek.brown@state.or.us">derek.brown@state.or.us</a>. Jeremy will email the committee the informational documents for alternative assessment. Questions about the extended assessment and opting out can be sent to Jeremy at <a href="mailto:jeremy.wells@state.or.us">jeremy.wells@state.or.us</a>.</p> <p>In regards to a comment made that the Feds have identified a policy restricting all states to a 1% cap on students taking alternative</p>

**The Oregon Department of Education is an equal opportunity agency and employer.**

	<p>assessments, the committee as requested clear guidance on what the “1% cap” means to school districts and specifically, for students with disabilities. Jeremy will follow up with this clarification.</p> <p>Committee members would like to be informed about how the extended assessment can be adapted to be more in line with instructional goals for those students who are most impacted with cognitive disabilities. The committee provided advisement that there be: a greater continuum of assessment options for the wide range of students with exceptionalities from those students for whom the extended assessment is far too difficult and not aligned to their instructional goals to include those students who do not have cognitive impairments but the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) is far too challenging and not aligned to their instructional goals.</p>
Threat Assessment	<p>Mitch Kruska updated the committee on threat assessment. Threat assessment, or risk assessment, is very subjective and there are no guidelines on it currently. Jeremy and Mitch are a part of the School Safety Task Force. The Task Force is currently working on producing a database of school facilities maps that could be used by first responders during threat situations. The database is mimicked after Washington State’s own facilities database and is estimated to cost twelve million dollars. School districts have teams that come together to discuss potential threats to the districts. Some districts meet frequently, and some meet only in the presence of a threat to discuss it. Threat assessment is preventative and proactive, and in doing so children get support rather than discipline. Threat assessment district teams are not mandated, however there was a bill proposed that could have defined threat assessment, but it was not sponsored by a legislator. In the future, more bills around threat assessment are expected to come up.</p> <p>Tammi Paul recommended that the School Safety Task Force include parents and that parents have the opportunity to provide input for the new policies surrounding threat assessment, especially when it affects children with disabilities. In her school district, the threat assessment was done without her knowledge when it was about her child. She was told by the school that she does not have access to any of the information in the threat assessment. Tammi asked the council to provide input on the guidelines for threat assessment, and specifically when parents are brought into the discussion.</p> <p>Jennifer Colachico provided information on how Salem-Keizer handles their threat assessment. Once the school threat assessment team decides there is a legitimate threat assessed with a student, the parents are invited in for an interview to keep them in the loop. Salem-Keizer is very transparent with their parents. Resources and supports are the biggest response to threat assessment. Rather than the negative they stick to the positive in the hopes of providing a student with a positive outcome rather than discipline. With the plans in place, there is a lower incidence of suspension and parents are able to assist in planning how to best assist with their children. At this time, districts are creating their own assessment guidelines until state guidelines are created.</p> <p>As guidelines are created, parents will be made aware of the threat assessment teams and policies. It is expected that there will be a level one threat assessment school based team in each school. A level two threat assessment will be made up of a broader team of professionals and will only be used when a level one team escalates a threat. The level two team will help develop safety plans and or other preventative processes for the student and will follow up weekly or monthly, based on the situation.</p>
(a) Parent Survey Update	<p>Jeremy Wells updated the committee on Parent and Family Involvement and the Parent Survey. Each state is required to develop a survey to measure parent involvement and improvement strategies to improve parent involvement. The parent survey has been updated through the work of a small stakeholders group. The primary changes were shortening the length between surveys from six years to three years for school age and two years for EI/ECSE, making the form and its questions more family friendly, and increasing the cut score to a 66.67% (which equates to an agree on all items). This equated to higher and more rigorous targets for all Districts and Contractors. Parent participation was around 10% and several options were discussed in how that percentage could improve.</p> <p>The committee advised that the survey go out via e-mail with a direct link or through synergy which the committee believes would greatly</p>

	<p>increase the participation of the survey. The school districts could additionally send out notifications to their parents. There is a concern that often families move or may not see something physically in the mail but may be more likely to find and respond to something electronically. Additionally, the committee was concerned with the availability of the survey in multiple languages and recommended broadening the number of languages available beyond English and Spanish.</p>
<p>SACSE Business / Summary of Meeting / Evaluation</p>	<p>Tammi Paul opened the floor for the committee to share acknowledgements, announcements, or general final thoughts pertaining to the SACSE. Members shared a general positive feeling towards where the SACSE is going, and many long term members shared that the relationship between the committee and ODE is much healthier and more positive. By having constructive conversations that are not always easy for everyone to have, the committee is better able to advise on services for students in Oregon. Often, the information that is provided during these meetings is presented earlier than the public would learn about it, and because of that, committee members feel that they are better able to help their constituents keep up to date with what is going on in Oregon.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m.</p>