



Maryland SESAC

SPECIAL EDUCATION STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Special Education State Advisory Committee (SESAC) General Meeting Minutes September 14, 2017

Attendance/Members: Kelly Meissner-Chair, Neal Lichter, Karleen Spitulnik, Samantha Carter, Martha Goodman, Brian Fausel, Diane McGowan, Jill Pierce, Kathy Barazotto, Leanne Carmona, Elisa Hartman, Audra Charbonnier, Tiombe Olumiji, Dorie Flynn, Marjorie Guldan, Valarie Ashton-Thomas, Pamela Talley

Guests: Jennifer Dale, MSDE, Carol Quirk, MCIE, Miguel Mercado, Audrey Levering, Julie Bellisello,

Absent: Sarah (Sally) Farr, Rachel London, Kathy Kaufman-Vice-Chair, Joyce Abbott, Vittoria Aiello, Ty Blackwell, Gaston Gamez, Frank Nanton, Jamie Stoner, Maura Taylor

Carmen Brown, MSDE, Staff to SESAC

- I. **Welcome/Introductions** –Kelly Meissner, Chair opened the meeting, provided an opportunity for introductions, and welcomed all new and returning members as well as guests.
- II. **State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)** - Presenters Jennifer Dale and Carol Quirk discussed the logic model, and grades 3-5 SSIP Plan for improving outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD) in Math. The presenters reviewed how and why math in grades 3-5 were chosen for the Part B SSIP. They reviewed the process of implementation science, and what counties will have focused math work. Feedback was requested on PARCC data collection to measure the impact of the SSIP work on math outcomes for students with disabilities.

DISCUSSION: Question: Is the data collected for all students or just special education students? **Response:** Data is collected for general education and special education students so we can measure performance of SWDs and the gap between SWDs and their non-disabled peers. **Question:** When you are looking at the data, what happens when you find out the data is showing a negative impact? **Response:** The team must go back through the data informed decision making process and make necessary adjustments. **Question:** How frequently do they go through the data informed decision making? **Response:** Three times/per year for data analysis and monthly meetings to look at data and action plan and to adjust, as appropriate. **Question:** How do you look at data three times/year if you only get PARCC scores 1x/year? **Response:** Systems use a universal screening tool to look for growth. **Question:** Why does PARCC matter? **Response:** It is the standard for measurement that cuts across all districts and other states. **Question:** How many students and schools are involved in the SSIP? **Response:** At least 2 schools/district where data is collected. Additionally, there are some systems implementing in all schools, but the

comparison is from the two identified schools in that district. **Question:** If we are looking at kids with IEPs, are there subcategories? **Response:** Teams are looking at that and using the student compass data to drill down to disability; knowing that we want to increase scores for all students with disabilities. **Question:** What is the most common qualifying IEP diagnosis? **Response:** Specific Learning Disability (SLD). **Question:** How do you look at growth? **Response:** Students receive their first score in 3rd grade. The baseline is set by those “meeting expectations” at this point. Then the team looks at progress; specifically looking at cohort data. **Question:** Does it have to be only the PARCC data for math in the standard or can it also include a district assessment? **Response:** District developed assessments can be used as benchmark data to measure progress toward the SiMR (PARCC data). Could the recommendation be to include 3, 4, and 5 scores on the PARCC assessment as a way to measure improvement on the SiMR? Yes. Progress on math IEP goals or local assessments are also a part of the SSIP evaluation, just not a part of the SiMR.

SSIP RECOMMENDATIONS by individual members of SESAC: Look at level 3 PARCC data for a period of 2 years since PARCC is new. Then transition to level 4 and 5; when using “Terms” I would align them to IDEA. Example “LSS” is the same as “LEA;” look at whether interventions do or do not yield specific instructional elements; include growth – children who show progress (children who improve from 1 → 2, 2 → 3); look at whether # of 3’s on PARCC is improving after implementation plan. See if it gives you valuable information or not; Growth vs. Absolute Score; opportunity to provide narrative may suggest NOT including the 3s; place a heavier emphasis on data collection than state assessments; look at students individually – how much progress is that child making from year to year; consider students who may not be a level 3, 4, or 5 but making marked improvement; State assessments test a student’s ability to take a test. It is also important to place a strong emphasis on other forms of data; the model for children with special education needs, progress should be based on growth from year to year; use level 3, 4, and 5 for 3rd grade because it is the first time taking PARCC. Then use level 4 and 5 for 4th and 5th grade.

III. **SESAC Priorities** – Kelly led the discussion regarding priorities for the SESAC for the 2017-2018 school year.

DISCUSSION: The group discussed and agreed that training with local directors and SESAC leadership is a priority as well as further discussion of a communication strategy.

PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS: It was recommended that the SESAC consider bringing Special Education County Advisory Committees (SECAC) leaders to SESAC, as appropriate to learn how each county is implementing local advisories, or host a joint meeting one time per year. It was recommended that the SESAC take the lead to guide SECACs by providing training for local directors and SECAC chairs. It was also recommended that the SESAC create a communication strategy workgroup. Karleen and Neal have agreed to facilitate the workgroup. Dissemination of information in the local school systems is a priority for SESAC members and recommendations will be addressed by the communication strategy workgroup. Additionally, the workgroup would consider recommendations to ensure IEP chairs, parents, and others know about initiatives, technical assistance, etc. SESAC members interested in working on the communication recommendations should reach out to Karleen.

IV. **SESAC Leadership** – Kelly led the discussion regarding SESAC leadership moving forward. She stated that this is her last year as Chair.

DISCUSSION: The discussion, led by Kelly, focused on the need for future leadership for the SESAC. She posed questions to the group related to what support do people require in order to serve as leaders of the SESAC; to serve on MSDE Committees; to understand the demands and skill set? Would it be helpful to shadow at committees, planning meetings, etc? The SESAC responded that it would be helpful to shadow Kelly. Individuals were urged to discuss their interests directly with Kelly in order for her to facilitate their involvement. It was suggested that the SESAC consider a MLL Blog or articles for SESAC, SECAC information and sharing, guidance for continuity within SECACs. This would require someone within SESAC to lead the work for the blog. Finally, Kelly offered the opportunity to apply for SESAC membership to the guests in attendance.

LEADERSHIP RECOMMENDATION: SESAC members need sufficient information to take on leadership roles. Current leadership was asked to provide specifics on what costs are reimbursable for parent members (follow-up required).

V. Restraint & Seclusion Workgroup – Neal Lichter was the SESAC representative on the Restraint and Seclusion Workgroup established as a result of HB331 (2017).

DISCUSSION: Neal provided a summary of the 16 recommendations from the workgroup that include a prohibition of restraint and seclusion except in emergency situations.

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

VI. DSE/EIS Updates - Marcella Franczkowski, Assistant State Superintendent facilitated a discussion with SESAC members.

DISCUSSION: Discussion from parents was specific to Bridge projects: structure, what happens after a student does not meet the passing scores on state assessments, how many projects, etc. Discussion re: alternate assessment and requiring consent include the initials of the parent by each consent. Discussion surrounding SECACs for each local system and the SESAC ensuring each exists and that SESAC is able to link to each.

RECOMMENDATIONS: DSE/EIS could consider including information about the bridge projects/alternate pathway to graduation in the parent consent TAB; the way it reads now you must pass the state assessments to earn a diploma implying. Additionally, the group suggested providing clarification regarding bridge/alternate pathways to graduation. There was a recommendation that on the IEP model form parents should initial next to the statement being consented to rather than simply checking a box or circling alternate assessment, alternate education program, or restraint or seclusion (Karla M brought to workgroup in October). This allows parents to be sure they understand what they are giving consent to (and reduces the possibility of fraud). It is also recommended that restraint and seclusion be in separate lines/statements (Karla M brought to workgroup in October). It was also requested that the link to the alternate academic standards be posted on the MSDE website (DONE). Marcella/Carmen will send a copy of the draft Preschool LRE TAB and the Home and Hospital Instruction revisions for SESAC review and comment (DONE). SESAC asked that annual IEP changes be posted to the website each year (DONE).

VII. Public Comment: Comments from guests/public in attendance were welcome throughout the meeting. It was noted that the meetings posted on the website need to be updated (DONE). It was also suggested that the SESAC focus on outreach to SECACs and Local Directors.

Next Meeting: January 11, 2018, 10am – 1pm