SESAC General Meeting
Johns Hopkins University  
Center for Technology in Education  
Columbia, Maryland  
1:00-4:00 p.m.  
November 17, 2011

MINUTES

Attendance: Rachel London, Chair; Mary Baskar, Vice Chair; Dorie Flynn, Kelly Meissner, Rhonda Creecy, Amy Morales, Pam Hardy-Cyran, Eileen Watson, Marlo Lemon

Excused: Howard ‘Andy’ Anderson, Dawn Koplos, Jacqueline Powell

Guests: Jean Satterfield, Assistant State Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Certification and Accreditation, Christie Timms, Consultant, Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE)

Staff: Sharon West, Allen Perrigan, Sheréa Makle

Ms. London opened the meeting at 1:10 p.m.

I. Welcome/Introductions: Attendees were welcomed and introduced themselves.

II. Membership: Ms. Baskar reviewed the SESAC membership grid, highlighting 6 parent slot vacancies and 2 agency slot vacancies. The group discussed membership possibilities, including Ms. London’s suggestion to nominate a staff person from the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE) for the Personnel Preparation slot.

III. SPP/APR Indicators Update: Allen Perrigan, Policy and Resource Specialist, MSDE Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) presented on behalf of Donna Riley. Mr. Perrigan shared a Status Report–Draft Preliminary Part B FFY 2010 APR–Indicator Performance At-A-Glance, November 17, 2011, and reviewed preliminary results for the following indicators:

- 4a - Suspension-Expulsion: Preliminary data, target not met
- 4b - Suspension-Expulsion (Race/Ethnicity): Preliminary data, target not met
- 9 - Disproportionate Representation (Race/Ethnicity): Preliminary data, target not met
- 10 – Disproportionate Representation (Race/Ethnicity & Disability): Preliminary data, target not met (98% v. 100%)
- 15 – General Supervision: Preliminary data, target not met (98% v 100%)
- 16 – State Complaints: Preliminary data, target met
- 17 – Due Process Complaints: Preliminary data, target met
Mr. Perrigan stated that a draft of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report for Federal Fiscal-Year 2010 would be shared with the SESAC by mid-December (via e-mail). Ms. London agreed to collect comments from SESAC members for submission to MSDE. MSDE will consider the comments and submit a final version of the report to the Office of Special Education Programs by February 1, 2012.

IV. Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) Flexibility

“The U.S. Department of Education is inviting each State educational agency (SEA) to request flexibility on behalf of itself, its local educational agencies, and schools, in order to better focus on improving student learning and increasing the quality of instruction. This voluntary opportunity will provide educators and State and local leaders with flexibility regarding specific requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive State-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction.” (http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility)

Ms. Jean Satterfield, Assistant State Superintendent, MSDE, Division of Certification and Accreditation presented an overview of Maryland’s consideration of ESEA Flexibility.

a. Goals of ESEA Flexibility: 1) improve education outcomes for all students; 2) close achievement gaps and increase equity; and 3) improve quality of instruction

b. Principles of ESEA Flexibility: 1) transitioning to college- and career-ready standards and assessments; 2) developing systems of differentiated recognition, accountability and support; 3) Evaluating teacher and principal effectiveness and supporting improvement; and 4) reducing duplication and unnecessary burden

c. Waivers of Provision of ESEA include flexibility: 1) regarding the 2013-2014 timeline for achieving 100% proficiency; 2) regarding district and school improvement and accountability requirements; and 3) related to the use of federal education funds.

d. Principle 2 Options: Option A sets AMOs to reduce by half the percentage of students in the “all students” group and in each subgroup who are not proficient with 6 years; Option B sets AMO for 100 percent of students achieving proficiency no later than the end of 2019-2020; and Option C would use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for LEAs, schools, and subgroups.

e. Principle 3: Establish basic guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation, develop with input from teachers and principals, will be based on multiple measures, including student progress over time, include multiple measures of professional practice, and provide clear feedback to teachers on how to improve instruction.

Ms. Satterfield shared that evaluation information for local school systems’ staff are available on the MSDE website – www.marylandpublicschools.org/ARRA/Race To The Top.)

f. Priority Schools include: 1) lowest 5 percent of Title I Schools; 2) based on
Achievement of “all students” in proficiency on statewide assessments that are part of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system; 3) Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with graduation rate less than 60 percent, and Tier I and Tier II school under the School Improvement Grant (SIG).

g. Focus Schools include: 1) Title I Schools with largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroups; or at high school level has the largest within-school gaps in graduation rates; 2) or a school that has a subgroup with low achievement or at the high school level low graduation rates; and 3) a Title I high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years that is not a priority school.

h. Reward Schools to include: 1) highest-performing school which is a Title I school with the highest absolute performance for “all students” group and for all subgroups; and 2) high-progress school which is a Title I school among the 10 percent of Title I schools in the State that are making the most progress in improving the performance of “all students” and, at the high school level, is also among the Title I schools in the State that are making the most progress in increasing graduation rates.

i. Staff and related committees are seeking input from diverse stakeholders and the community in the development of the ESEA Flexibility waiver request.

j. Maryland is considering whether to submit a waiver request in February 2012.

Ms. London and others expressed concern that the proposed criteria for “Priority Schools” and “Focus Schools” misses a key component of closing achievement gaps for all subgroups, specifically students with disabilities—as students with disabilities who do not attend Title I schools would not be considered for additional support.

V. Parent Survey (Indicator 8): Sharon West, Branch Chief, Student Achievement and Professional Development Branch, MSDE, DSE/EIS, recalled the group’s work on the Parent Survey questions during the September 22nd General Meeting. A draft list of proposed questions, stemming from the group’s work, was provided for review. Discussion followed. Key outcomes include:

a. The Survey needs to include a mechanism for parents to identify their child as a nonpublic school attendee.

b. The language “special education services” in several questions needs to be reconsidered.

c. Survey questions must be explicit and as clear as possible.

d. Further review and discussion is needed. Ms. West gave each SESAC member in attendance a copy of the Final Report on OSEP Indicator #8 for School-Year 2010/2011. Ms. West agreed to send all SESAC members an electronic copy of the Report, along with the 2010/2011 Parent Survey and the draft list of proposed question. Feedback and comments can be shared with Ms. London who will send them along to MSDE, DSE/EIS for consideration prior to sharing with local Directors of Special Education for review.

Ms. West reminded SESAC members that Survey questions are pulled from a bank of recommended questions from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). Some questions may or may not be editable.
VI. Maryland Learning Links: Christie Timms, JHU/CTE Consultant, provided an introduction to the Maryland Learning Links website. Maryland Learning Links is a partnership of MSDE, DSE/EIS and the JHU/CTE. Presentation highlights include:

a. www.MarylandLearningLinks.org is a designed as a comprehensive early intervention/special education website for anyone interested in the topics.
b. Built upon a model created by the George Lucas Foundation–EDUTOPIA.org.
c. The MLL trailer was previewed (a marketing video set to the tune of “ABC” by the Jackson 5).
d. Developed over the past 5 years through the MSIIG grant. Launched at the 2011 Fall Leadership Conference, October 12, 2011.
e. Features include:
   - Media rich, dynamic, active web site
   - Closed-captioned videos; Section 508 accessibility-compliant; accessible to individuals with blindness and other visual impairments
   - Opportunities for users to not only view content but to contribute content via blogs, polls, surveys, and etc.
   - Resources and events
   - Blogs (read and join in the discussions) – Must be “linked” as an account holder in order to contribute to the blogs!
   - Discussions
   - Events
   - Featured Stories, comments, key events
   - Connected to iTunes and YouTube (providing and sharing content)
   - Six Channels: Birth-Five; Teaching All Students; Professional Practice; Leadership: Family and Community, and Policy
f. MSIIG was funded with an emphasis on 6-12. However, the Birth-5 component is incorporated and includes content that complements the Maryland Early Childhood (EC) Gateway. Plans are underway for the Birth-5 component to be incorporated throughout all channels of the site.
g. Ms. Timms encouraged participants to “Get Linked” as registered Learning Links users and to provide content and engage in online discussions, receive the e-newsletter and participate in communities. And to keep the site robust, a byline procedure is available for users to contribute content. Follow the “Contact Us” for Terms of Use Policy and instructions.
h. Participants responded with excitement to Maryland Learning Links and asked for routine updates and marketing materials to share with staff, partners and clients.

VII. Comments/Open Discussion: Ms. London opened the floor for public comment and discussion. None was provided.

Ms. London adjourned the meeting at 3:57 p.m.