

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Raleigh, North Carolina
December 11, 2019
9:33 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF QUARTERLY MEETING

The quarterly meeting of the Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children was held on the 11th day of December, 2019, in the State Board of Education Boardroom, Education Building, 301 North Wilmington Street, Raleigh, North Carolina, commencing at 9:33 a.m.

APPEARANCES

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leanna George, Chairperson
Cynthia Daniels-Hall, Vice Chairperson

Anthony Baker
Sara Bigley (via Webinar)
Diane Coffey
Christy Grant
Christy Hutchinson
Selene Johnson
Virginia Moorefield
Jennifer DeGen (via Webinar)
Jennifer Frey (via Webinar)
Cache Owens (via Webinar)
Lisa Phillips (via Webinar)
Kenya Pope
Representative Larry Strickland
Marge Terhaar (via Webinar)
Charlene Timmons (via Webinar)

STAFF:

Matt Hoskins
Teresa King
Danyelle Sanders
Alexis Utz

VISITORS:

Eric Hall
Public Speaker 1
Public Speaker 2
Public Speaker 3
Public Speaker 4
Public Speaker 5

COURT REPORTER:

Rebecca P. Scott

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

Call to Order and Introductions..... 4

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report
presentation by Nancy Johnson..... 10

Agency Updates by Matt Hoskins..... 84

Recognition of Chairperson/Vice Chairperson by
Matt Hoskins..... 105

Nominations for Chairperson/Vice Chairperson..... 109

Luncheon Recess..... 112

Voting for Chairperson/Vice Chairperson..... 112

Public Comments

Public Speaker 1..... 114

Public Speaker 2..... 117

Public Speaker 3..... 131

Public Speaker 4..... 136

Public Speaker 5..... 145

Upcoming Policy Proposal and Dispute Resolution
Annual Report presentation by Teresa King.. 156

Meeting Adjournment..... 229

Certificate of Reporter..... 230

- - - - -

1 Thereupon, the following proceeding was held:

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome to today's
3 meeting with the Council on Educational Services
4 for Exceptional Children. I call this meeting to
5 order. Hopefully, we'll have a few more that will
6 straggle in this morning. Maybe it's just weather
7 or traffic delays because I know how traffic can
8 be here in Raleigh.

9 So my name is Leanna George. I'm the
10 Chair of this committee. I have two children with
11 exceptionalities. My daughter is 17 years old.
12 She attends McDowell County High School. She's in
13 a group home in Marion, North Carolina. My son is
14 actually homeschooled, and we live in Johnston
15 County.

16 I think I'll start with Christy
17 Hutchinson, and we'll just kind of go around the
18 table counterclockwise.

19 MS. HUTCHINSON: Christy Hutchinson,
20 EC Director for Lincoln Charter School and the
21 charter school representative on this committee.

22 MS. SANDERS: I'm Danyelle Sanders,
23 EC Division, Policy, Monitoring, and Audit.

24 COURT REPORTER: Good morning. I'm
25 Becky Scott. I'm the court reporter making a

1 record today.

2 MS. UTZ: Hi. Alexis Utz. I'm the
3 new Parent Liaison that started in September.

4 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: Good
5 morning. I'm Representative Larry Strickland. I
6 represent Harnett and Johnston Counties. I'm from
7 Johnston County. I served 18 years on the
8 Johnston County Board of Education, before going
9 to the General Assembly, eight years as its
10 chairman. So I'm delighted to be here.

11 MS. POPE: Good morning. I'm Kenya
12 Pope. I'm with Educational Services for Juvenile
13 Justice.

14 MS. COFFEY: I'm Diane Coffey. I'm a
15 parent in Watauga County. I have two children.
16 My youngest has autism.

17 MS. DANIELS-HALL: I'm Cynthia
18 Daniels-Hall. I'm a parent in Wake County. I
19 have children on the autism spectrum, and I'm also
20 a special education advocate across the state.

21 MS. GRANT: Christy Grant. I am the
22 Exceptional Children's Director at Nash-Rocky
23 Mount Schools, and I am the representative for
24 traditional LEAs.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Anyone from the --

1 anybody else that would like to introduce
2 themselves so we know who is with us today?

3 **(No audible response.)**

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. It's not
5 required.

6 MS. UTZ: I just need to unmute their
7 microphones, so give me one second.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Those who
9 are online, one at a time -- maybe I'll call your
10 name and---

11 MS. UTZ: Cache Owens, I unmuted you.

12 MS. OWENS: Good morning, everybody.
13 My name is Cache Owens. I'm the Parent Training
14 and Information Center Director with ECAC
15 [inaudible]. I'm also the parent of a child with
16 mental health challenges and autism [inaudible].

17 MS. UTZ: Thank you. Welcome.
18 Charlene, I have you unmuted.

19 MS. TIMMONS: [Inaudible].

20 MS. UTZ: Jennifer DeGen, I have you
21 unmuted. Welcome. Can you hear us?

22 **(No audible response.)**

23 MS. UTZ: Jennifer Frey?

24 MS. FREY: I'm Jennifer Frey. I'm a
25 parent of a 20-year-old son with autism. I'm in

1 the Mecklenburg County region, and my son is in
2 Mecklenburg County Schools.

3 MS. UTZ: Welcome. Next we have Lisa
4 Phillips.

5 MS. PHILLIPS: Good morning. This is
6 Lisa Phillips, State Coordinator for Homeless
7 Education, and I'm on the road today so I
8 apologize if there's any difficulty in hearing me.

9 MS. UTZ: You came in loud and clear.
10 Next is Marge. I'm sorry. I have no idea how to
11 say your last name.

12 MS. TERHAAR: This is Marge Terhaar,
13 and I am the Coordinator of Graduate Programs in
14 Special Education at Meredith and a mother of two
15 adult sons with disabilities.

16 MS. UTZ: Welcome. All right.
17 Nancy, I see you're next.

18 DR. JOHNSON: I'm Nancy Johnson. I'm
19 the coordinator for our Annual Performance Report
20 and State Performance Plan, and I'll be doing a
21 brief presentation shortly.

22 MS. UTZ: Thank you. Welcome.

23 DR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry I couldn't be
24 there in person.

25 MS. UTZ: All right. And last, I

1 believe, is Sara Bigley.

2 MS. BIGLEY: Hi. This is Sara
3 Bigley. I'm the State Coordinator for Foster Care
4 Education. Glad to be here today. Thanks to
5 everybody.

6 MS. UTZ: Thank you and welcome. All
7 right.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Anthony --
9 Mr. Baker just came in. Would you like to
10 introduce yourself?

11 MR. BAKER: Yes. I'm Anthony Baker,
12 and I'm the general ed administration
13 representative from Alamance-Burlington School
14 System.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Anthony.
16 All right. We have a wonderful new parent
17 liaison -- glad to have one -- as well as new
18 staff supporting the Council, Danyelle. So be
19 expecting her emails instead of Tish's from here
20 on out.

21 As we know, Tish transferred over to
22 the Governor's School department, and she kind of
23 was hesitant to let go of this baby. She's loved
24 this Council for many, many years, and but now
25 it's in the hands of Danyelle, and I'm sure she's

1 going to do an excellent job with it.

2 MS. SANDERS: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: We have a couple of
4 new members who have joined us this year.

5 Mr. Strickland is new this year. Is there any
6 other new members?

7 MS. UTZ: We just had Ginny
8 Moorefield reelected for a second term---

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Hey, Ginny.

10 MS. UTZ: ---as she walks in.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: I can't remember
12 how many openings we had for this upcoming year.

13 MS. UTZ: I think we have a few more
14 openings, but nothing has been finalized yet.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Sounds
16 like a plan. Okay. Are there any questions about
17 the agenda?

18 **(No audible response.)**

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: No. Good. If
20 you'd like to run for chair or vice chair, be
21 thinking about that because we're going to have
22 nominations and an election today for that
23 position because I have to step down.

24 And any other questions before we get
25 started with our State Performance Plan and Annual

1 Performance Review part of the meeting?

2 (No audible response.)

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Once you're
4 settled, Ginny, if you'd like to introduce
5 yourself, that would be wonderful.

6 MS. MOOREFIELD: I am Ginny
7 Moorefield, and I serve as a regular ed teacher,
8 an interpreter for the deaf, and also a parent of
9 a child with traumatic brain injury.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you,
11 Virginia. If Nancy's ready, we're ready for her
12 presentation.

13 DR. JOHNSON: Can you hear me?

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Loud and clear.

15 DR. JOHNSON: You can hear me?

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, we can hear
17 you.

18 DR. JOHNSON: For some reason, I
19 can't see your screen.

20 MS. UTZ: Wait. I forgot to hit a
21 button. Okay. There you go.

22 DR. JOHNSON: There it is.

23 MS. UTZ: Okay.

24 DR. JOHNSON: Okay. Good morning,
25 everyone, and thank you for letting me participate

1 virtually since I had to be out of town for a
2 meeting -- another meeting. I am the State
3 Coordinator for our State Performance Plan and
4 Annual Performance Report. Those of you who
5 are -- have been on the Council for more than a
6 year now have heard me present in the past each
7 December about where we are with our State
8 Performance Plan.

9 So today I'm going to -- two things:
10 I'm going to briefly just give a brief background,
11 particularly for those of you who are new, about
12 our State Performance Plan and Annual Performance
13 Report. Most of our time, we're going to spend on
14 talking about setting targets for some of our
15 indicators, which is one thing that we have to do
16 this year, and it's the only thing that's going to
17 be different about our report.

18 So, Alexis, if you could move to the
19 slide, or did you give me the slides?

20 MS. UTZ: No, I just kept it so that
21 you could just focus on your presentation.

22 DR. JOHNSON: Okay. So if you'll
23 move to the next slide.

24 MS. UTZ: I did. Can you see it?

25 DR. JOHNSON: It's not moving. Let

1 me see if I can help here. So as long as they're
2 seeing it, maybe I can---

3 MS. UTZ: Here. I'll make you a
4 presenter. Okay. Do you have your presentation?
5 Because I think we're seeing your screen now. No,
6 you're not. I can see your screen. They cannot
7 see your screen. All right. They can see your
8 second screen here.

9 (Pause.)

10 DR. JOHNSON: So, again, we're going
11 to be focusing on setting targets -- certain
12 targets for the performance plan today. You can
13 move on to the next screen.

14 Okay. Our State Performance Plan and
15 Annual Performance Report, you can see is one of
16 our bubbles that is part of our general
17 supervision responsibilities, which we have many
18 at the State -- general supervision
19 responsibilities as it relates to students with
20 disabilities, and this is just one component of
21 the responsibilities.

22 Next screen. Here is just a brief
23 overview of our 17 indicators that we have to
24 report on annually. The first 16 we report on by
25 February 1st or this year February 3rd, I believe,

1 because February 1st is on a weekend, and then
2 Indicator 17 will be reported on, on April 1st.
3 The green indicates -- those are the indicators
4 we're going to be focused on today for setting
5 targets.

6 If you can move on to the next
7 screen. Just a brief background. This will be --
8 February 3rd, 2020, will be our fourteenth APR
9 submission. We've been doing this for 14 years.
10 There are now 17 indicators. There were
11 previously 20, and they combined some and
12 eliminated some and added Indicator 17.

13 There are a combination of compliance
14 and outcome indicators, and the difference in
15 those is compliance is like our 90-day timeline
16 for evaluating a student and determining
17 eligibility and placing them. A compliance
18 indicator is required with set targets. An
19 outcome indicator is like graduation rates,
20 outcomes that we expect for students. April 1st
21 of 2020 will be our fifth submission of Indicator
22 17, which is our State Systemic Improvement Plan,
23 which is around that five-year graduation rate.

24 Okay. If you'll go on to the next
25 slide. Now we're going to talk a little bit about

1 what we're going to do just in the brief time I
2 have with you. It's about setting indicator
3 targets. This is the last year of our -- this
4 submission is the last year of our six-year plan,
5 if you will, and we will be starting next year
6 with a new six-year plan. However, when they
7 count -- something happened and OSEP kept adding
8 years to our plan that we didn't have targets for
9 FFY 2019, which is based on the data that we're
10 getting this year for the school year 2019-20.

11 And so they recently told us, "Oh, by
12 the way, for this report, you have to add targets
13 for one year only." So those targets that we're
14 going to be talking about setting today will be
15 submitted in this report in 2020. But just so you
16 know, as we talk about these, I also want you to
17 think about over the next five or six years. Next
18 year at this time, we'll be developing and
19 submitting our full report for six years, and we
20 will have to include targets -- this will be in
21 February of 2021, and we will have to include
22 targets for the years 2020 through 2025.

23 So I'll be explaining a little bit
24 about this, but keep in mind that what we do this
25 year is one thing, but then start thinking ahead

1 because it will take us awhile to think ahead for
2 all of those years.

3 This time, which indicators do we get
4 to set targets for? Compliance indicators are
5 preset targets, and those compliance indicators
6 I've listed by numbers, and 4b is suspensions, 9
7 and 10 are about the identification of students
8 with disabilities, Indicator 11 is about our
9 90-day timeline, Indicator 12 is about children
10 who are turning three years old and moving from
11 part c to part b, and Indicator 13 is our
12 transition -- our postsecondary transition or
13 secondary transition, high school.

14 So those are complaints indicators,
15 and OSEP sets those targets. We're required to be
16 at either 100 percent compliance or have zero
17 percent of LEAs having noncompliance. So the
18 indicators we're going to be focused on today are
19 outcome indicators, and they're the ones listed
20 there. I'm not going to go over each one of them
21 since we're going to discussing each one as we go
22 through.

23 You can go to the next slide, Alexis.
24 Thank you. Here are our requirements for this
25 year for setting targets. They must be greater

1 than our baseline in most instances. There's a
2 couple of times that they tell us it doesn't have
3 to be greater than our baseline data, and I'll be
4 going over that with you with each of the
5 indicators.

6 Indicators 15 and 16, which are about
7 resolution sessions when someone files for a due
8 process hearing or mediation, can be a range of
9 percentage rates, and we must consider stakeholder
10 input. The advisory council is one of our
11 stakeholder groups for our APR, and so we do
12 always try to get input from you if we're going to
13 be making any changes to the report. And in this
14 instance, of course, because we're going to be
15 including new targets, we do need your input and
16 recommendations.

17 Our options for this year, OSEP has
18 told us that we could just maintain whatever our
19 current target was from this year for one more
20 year since they're asking us to just submit for
21 one more year, and they didn't give us a lot of
22 planning time to really analyze our data and see
23 how we should be projecting out.

24 Or we can increase or decrease the
25 current targets, depending on what the target is -

1 - and you'll see what I'm talking about when we go
2 through these -- for the one year only. That is,
3 again, what we're doing, is for the one year.
4 But, again, as we go over these targets in just a
5 second, I want you to keep in mind that next year
6 we will be setting targets out for five or six
7 years.

8 Okay. You should have a handout that
9 has the title "Setting Indicator Targets," and it
10 is a list of all the targets that we're going to
11 be setting or all of the indicators that we're
12 going to be setting targets for, and it should
13 look similar to this slide, but it has all of the
14 targets on it. And we will be emailing that to
15 you so that you can -- when you respond, you can
16 send it back to me electronically, but I'm going
17 to go through this with you so you can see what
18 we're asking you to do.

19 So if you'll start -- with this
20 slide, I've got graduation rate, target 1 and --
21 or Indicator 1 and Indicator 2, our dropout rate.
22 I'm going to start with talking about these. The
23 first column indicates which indicator it is, and
24 you'll notice for both of these indicators, we are
25 at a one-year data lag. So even though we are

1 submitting most of the APR in 2018-19 school year
2 data, the data we'll be submitting for these two
3 are -- these two indicators is 2017-2018 data.

4 The next column is our baseline.
5 Remember I said that we had to be higher -- the
6 target must be higher than whatever our baseline
7 data was. So I've included in that a first column
8 what our baseline data was when we first started
9 reporting this data and the year that it was
10 considered baseline, and you'll notice for these
11 two, the baselines are different, and I'll explain
12 why, because you're going to see different
13 baseline years in this.

14 The graduation rate, 2009 was the
15 first year we started reporting a cohort
16 graduation rate, so it changed the data that we
17 were actually reporting. We had to do that to
18 keep in line with our Elementary and Secondary
19 Education Act, the law that was in place at that
20 time. You can see our baseline for graduation was
21 49.40 percent.

22 For dropout, our baseline was 2005.
23 That was the first year we ever submitted an APR,
24 and we have continued to use the same rate, same
25 formula, same data the entire time. So that is

1 our baseline rate for that, and at that time, our
2 dropout rate was 9.21 percent.

3 The next column is the current data
4 that we will be reporting in our APR, the FFY 2018
5 so 2018-19 school year data, except in these two
6 instances it's 2017-18 data. So for the
7 graduation rate, I have included our 2017-18 data,
8 which is 69.10 percent. Now I've also included
9 our 2018-19 so that you could see that we have had
10 some slight improvement because we already have
11 that data. That data came out this past summer.
12 So I'll be discussing that in the APR.

13 But our target -- our actual data
14 will be the 69.10 percent for graduation. You can
15 see then our target, which was already set and it
16 was based on at the time what our target was for
17 all students, is 80 percent. You can see that we
18 haven't reached that yet. We're working towards
19 that, but we're not there yet.

20 So we have a choice, as you think
21 about this -- you don't make these decisions right
22 now, but as you think about this and give us
23 input, do you want to recommend that we maintain
24 that target for this year -- for this next year or
25 do you want to increase the FFY 2019 target.

1 And if you do want to increase it,
2 you would have to indicate -- we would like you to
3 indicate what you would like us to consider for
4 the increase. But, as you can see, we're on a
5 trajectory from way back when our baseline was at
6 49 percent and we're at 59 percent -- so we're on
7 a trajectory to make progress, but we're not at
8 that 80 percent target yet. So setting that
9 higher may or may not be a good recommendation.

10 With dropout, dropout is a little bit
11 different because instead of an increase, we're
12 looking to decrease the dropout rate. Our
13 baseline was at 9.21 percent, and we are currently
14 this year at -- well, this year -- 2017-18 -- and
15 we don't have the 2018-19 data. They're still
16 calculating that for me. The 4.35 percent is what
17 we will be reporting. We did overtime lower our
18 targets, and you can see that the 3.0 percent is
19 less than 9.2 percent, which is where we have to
20 be, but we are -- we haven't reached that target.
21 There was a year or two that we had reached our
22 targets for dropout, and this tends to go up and
23 down a little bit, this rate, but we are not at
24 our 3.0 percent target yet.

25 So, again, you have the choice of

1 recommending that we maintain that 3.0 for one
2 year or decrease it -- this is one that has to be
3 decreased, and it would have to be -- the target
4 would have to be 2.99 percent or less, if you were
5 interested in recommending that we decrease it for
6 this one year only.

7 Keep in mind for the next six years,
8 we probably will be making recommendations to not
9 only increase graduation but also to decrease
10 dropout over the six-year period in the next
11 go-round.

12 MS. HUTCHINSON: Nancy, can I ask one
13 question?

14 DR. JOHNSON: You-all may have
15 questions, and so I'm going to ask you -- just so
16 I can get -- if you can write your question down
17 for which indicator you have a question about, and
18 then -- so I can move on. If it is a general
19 question, I can maybe go ahead and answer that.

20 MS. HUTCHINSON: I just had a quick
21 question. Comparatively, our dropout rate goal is
22 three percent, and currently, it's at 4.3. Remind
23 me what that was compared to regular ed, or do we
24 not have that information?

25 DR. JOHNSON: Right this minute, I

1 don't have it because I can't see -- I can't get
2 into anything else on my computer right now to see
3 that. But it is -- regular ed is a little bit
4 lower than -- I think they were at two point
5 something this year.

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: For the goal or for
7 the data?

8 DR. JOHNSON: For their actual data.
9 They don't -- regular ed doesn't have to submit
10 goals like we have to submit. The Exceptional
11 Children Division is the only one that has to
12 actually submit targets that we're required to
13 work toward. They submit that data, but not in
14 the same way that we have to. In general ed, they
15 did increase what they're focusing on for
16 graduation, I believe, over the next several
17 years, which we will have an opportunity to do
18 that as well in the next six-year time frame.

19 Alexis, if you can move on unless
20 there's more questions. Okay. Indicator 3b and c
21 is about our state participation in statewide
22 assessments, and our participation is 3b and our
23 proficiency on state assessments is 3c. And in
24 this instance, we look at participation and
25 proficiency in math and reading only. That's all

1 we're required to report on for students with
2 disabilities. In our bigger plan, we report on
3 science and other areas.

4 And we also have to report by grade
5 level, and we can set our targets by grade level.
6 So it might look a little confusing on here. We
7 do this by grades 3 through 8. We report on the
8 individual grades, but we set the targets the same
9 for grades 3 through 8 and grade 10 for reading
10 and grade 11 for math because we have to report on
11 one grade level in high school.

12 So for the participation rate, our
13 participation rate -- our baseline was
14 greater than -- this is an area where our target
15 is not quite more than our baseline because when
16 we originally submitted back in 2005, our
17 target -- or our data was actually greater than 95
18 percent, but the way our ESSA plan is written, 95
19 percent is considered appropriate to have all kids
20 included and participating and that there are
21 those opportunities for kids with medical
22 considerations or for other reasons not to be
23 included in the assessments.

24 So our data for 2018-19, we do not
25 have yet. I'm showing you our data for 2017

1 because they haven't calculated and given me that
2 final data yet, and that will be in our -- OSEP
3 won't upload that to our report until January.
4 But we have, for the last several years, been at
5 greater than 95 percent each of those years. So
6 our target is 95 percent, and that is the same
7 target that is in our ESSA plan for all kids. So
8 we mirror their targets.

9 And, again, we can maintain that
10 target or increase that slightly if you thought
11 that would be appropriate. However, that is --
12 the 95 percent is the target for all kids as well,
13 so if we try to increase that, we would be
14 recommending that we have a higher target for
15 students with disabilities than we do for all
16 students.

17 Proficiency, on the other hand, is a
18 little bit different. Our baseline was new in
19 2012 when our assessments and curriculum and
20 things changed. Our baseline -- I didn't list
21 those for each of grade areas, but it was less
22 than 20 percent for each of our grade levels
23 including grades 3 through 8 and grades 10 and 11.
24 Again, for 2018-19, that's still to be determined.
25 I haven't been given that data or provided that

1 data yet, but we were still at less than 20
2 percent for all grades, reading and math, except
3 for grade 3 math, which was at 22.67 percent. Now
4 I will say we did not lose or we didn't have any
5 slippage. We kind of maintained where we were,
6 but again, our proficiency scores were fairly low
7 at less than 20 percent for all grade levels.

8 Our targets, you can see, are quite a
9 bit higher, and our targets do come from our ESSA
10 plan. We selected to use [inaudible] targets from
11 our ESSA plan, which is our Elementary and
12 Secondary Act, and that's the plan for all
13 students, and those were the targets that the
14 State submitted for students with disabilities
15 within that plan. And so we chose, for this plan,
16 to use the same targets because it wouldn't make
17 sense to use a different set of targets.

18 But our targets for this year and
19 actually next year are -- in the ESSA plan are
20 56.4 percent for grades 3 through 8 math and
21 reading, and our target for eleventh-grade math is
22 54.7 percent, and our target for tenth-grade
23 reading is 57 percent. So we have three areas
24 where we need to make recommendations about
25 targets -- about maintaining that current target

1 or increasing these targets.

2 And, again, you can see less than 20
3 percent, except grade 3 math and it came in at
4 22.67 percent. We have not come close to reaching
5 our targets yet. We are working again towards
6 those targets, but we have not again reached them.
7 Again, we'll have an opportunity to reset these
8 all for six years.

9 If you'd go to the next slide.
10 Indicator 4a is an outcome target, and it's about
11 suspension of students with disabilities who
12 receive long-term suspensions, and again, this is
13 on a one-year data lag. So it's data that's
14 2017-18, and we don't have our 2018-19 data yet
15 anyway. But our baseline was 2.60 percent back in
16 2005, and what that was, was 2.6 percent of our
17 LEAs had kids who were suspended long-term that
18 were over our significant discrepancy rate. So we
19 had 2.6 percent of our districts who were over a
20 certain rate for long-term suspicion.

21 We have changed to using a 3.0 risk
22 ratio for that requirement, but in this year of
23 2017-18, which is what we're reporting on, we had
24 one district out of 293 districts at the time that
25 was at .34 percent rate of our districts. Our

1 target, you can see, is lower there. Our
2 baseline is 2.50 percent. So by just having one
3 district that [inaudible] is less than our target.

4 Again, we can maintain our target and
5 say we don't want more than 2.5 percent of our
6 districts having suspensions and expulsions
7 long-term or we could decrease that target
8 slightly. Again, that's a recommendation. This
9 is an area, I will tell you, on long-term
10 suspensions, for suspension rates, this is not
11 usually an issue too much for us. Like I said, we
12 had one district, and last year, we didn't
13 have -- the previous year, we didn't have any
14 districts that were on the list.

15 Our area of suspension, which is not
16 what we report -- our area for suspensions of
17 concern is more multiple short-term suspensions
18 that kids get, but that's not what we report on in
19 the APR. So that is where we are with that, and
20 that rate again is related to the percentage of
21 districts that have this rate.

22 Alexis, if you could move to the next
23 slide. Indicators 5a, b, and c are about our
24 least restrictive environment for school-aged
25 children ages six through 21 in their education

1 environments. 5a is about those kids who are
2 placed in regular 80 percent or more of the day,
3 and our baseline back in 2005, when we first
4 submitted, was 61.56 percent, our target was 65
5 percent, and our current data is 67.43 percent.
6 So we have met our target, we've exceeded our
7 target, but our target is more than our baseline.

8 5b are education environments where
9 students are in regular ed less than 40 percent of
10 the day, so they're considered separate -- not
11 separate environments, but a separate class-type
12 environment less than 40 percent of the day. And
13 our target -- or at the time, our actual data in
14 2005 was 16.82 percent.

15 Our target, in this instance, has to
16 be less because we're looking to decrease the
17 number of students who are in separate
18 placements -- or in our regular ed less than 40
19 percent of the day. So our target is at 15
20 percent, and currently, our data we're showing at
21 13.96 percent.

22 And then our third area we have to
23 report on is educational environments which are
24 separate, and that's separate schools, residential
25 placements, and other separate placements outside

1 a regular school. And our baseline data was at
2 2.27 percent, our current data is 1.77 percent,
3 and our target is two percent.

4 With all three of these targets, I do
5 want to share with you, over the last few years,
6 we've kind of hit a plateau and we're maintaining
7 pretty close to our data. It's not shifting too
8 much, so we feel like we did a pretty good job of
9 setting our targets. One thing that will change
10 with us next year when we talk about setting
11 targets for the next five or six years, there has
12 been a change in regulations about five-year-old
13 students in kindergarten, and right now we report
14 all five-year-olds in the next indicator that I'm
15 going to talk about.

16 But starting next year, when we get
17 ready to set new targets, we're going to be
18 including five-year-olds in preschool with the
19 preschool data and five-year-olds in kindergarten
20 with the Indicator 5 data. So that will shift
21 some of our numbers, and we will have to take a
22 look at setting targets considering additional
23 students in some areas and fewer students in the
24 indicator settings. But right now, we have again
25 the data 67.43, 13.96 percent, and 1.77 percent.

1 It shifted a little bit, but not too much. We're
2 maintaining our rates pretty much for the last few
3 years.

4 If you can move to the next one.
5 Indicator 6 is about preschool environments for
6 children who are ages three to five, and this
7 includes five-year-olds who are in kindergarten.
8 So we have to cross-walk them back to this data.
9 It is about preschool environments so regular
10 early childhood programs and separate
11 environments.

12 Our baseline for these, because they
13 change definitions in preschool for settings, were
14 submitted in 2014. For regular environments, our
15 baseline data was at 36.65 percent, and our
16 target -- at the time when we set targets, our
17 target for this year is 38 percent. You can see
18 our data is only at 34.87 percent, so we have not
19 met our target this year.

20 And for preschool environments that
21 are separate, our baseline was at 21.6 percent,
22 and our target is -- in that area, our target
23 would be less so we would want to decrease
24 [inaudible]. Our target this year was 19.4
25 percent, and our data was at 21.07 percent. So we

1 haven't moved much in that area. We have
2 decreased slightly, but we have not yet met our
3 target.

4 For both Indicators 5 and 6, some of
5 you may have noticed that we left out a group of
6 students. In Indicator 5, we don't discuss or
7 talk about students who are in regular ed between
8 [inaudible] percent of the day. We still report
9 that data to OSEP, but they do not require us to
10 include it. They don't even give us a way to
11 include it in the APR. So we don't report on it
12 here, even though we report that data to OSEP.

13 It is the same for students who are
14 preschool. There are a group of students who get
15 a combination of regular ed and some special
16 education that fall in between the regular early
17 childhood program and the separate program. So
18 these percentages won't add up to a hundred
19 percent because a group of students are not
20 reported on here, even though we report that data
21 to OSEP.

22 Alexis, please move to the next
23 slide. Indicator 7a, this is about outcomes
24 for preschool, and they are -- positive
25 social-emotional skills is 7a. Acquisition and

1 use of knowledge and skills is 7b, and the
2 outcomes -- the third outcome is use of
3 appropriate behaviors to meet needs. And you can
4 see there's an A and a B in one, and we have to
5 set targets for each A and B.

6 And A is about students who have made
7 progress, and B is about students who have made
8 progress and are now performing similar to their
9 nondisabled peers, and that's true for A and B in
10 each one. As you can see, the baseline data is in
11 that first column. When they set targets in this
12 area for preschool, because this was relatively
13 new -- you can see that we submitted this in
14 2013 -- we didn't really have any data to project
15 how kids were going to project out, so we did have
16 slight increases, but our final -- that third
17 column shows what are current targets are.
18 They're slightly higher than our baseline data.

19 And you can see in each instance, if
20 you look at the middle column, for positive
21 social-emotional outcomes, 7a, for A, we are at
22 84.92 percent, which is higher than our target.
23 For B, we are at 38.72 percent, which is higher
24 than our target.

25 And the same in 7b for acquisition

1 and use of knowledge and skills, we are a little
2 bit higher than our target at 83.4 percent. For
3 B, we are little bit higher than our target at
4 36.95 percent. And then in c, preschool outcomes,
5 use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs, in
6 that area, 84.02 percent, we're a little bit
7 higher than our target, and B, also 53.95 percent
8 or higher than our target.

9 So in this instance, now we will be
10 using -- particularly for the next -- when we go
11 to do the report for the next six years, we will
12 look at our trend data from 2013 to now to figure
13 out how to do projections about how we have made
14 progress over the years and be recommending some
15 targets that project out. We just didn't have
16 time to do that since they just informed us last
17 month that we had to come back and set targets for
18 just one year, but you can see that we have
19 steadily made progress over time.

20 Parent involvement. Parent
21 involvement is about parents who we survey. This
22 is a survey that we do for a random sample. We do
23 about a fifth of our districts each year, so not
24 all districts are included in this data, except
25 our large five districts, and the large five

1 districts do it by doing some of their schools
2 each year.

3 It's about meaningful involvement --
4 parents [inaudible] meaningful involvement
5 [inaudible] supported and provided meaningful
6 involvement related to IEP meetings and other
7 aspects so that they can help make those
8 recommendations for their student as it relates to
9 their special ed [inaudible].

10 This is a 25-item survey that we send
11 out. We used to use a contractor to do this, and
12 this year, we sent the survey out through the
13 State, and we did not get as good a response rate
14 back as we were hoping. We were hoping it would
15 improve our response rate. It did not. We are
16 still analyzing this data, so I'm going to just
17 share with you the data from previous years.

18 When we started in 2006 when we first
19 had to submit this indicator, our districts were
20 at -- about 26 percent of parents were reporting
21 that they had meaningful involvement. You can see
22 from that 26 percent back in 2006, we set our
23 target pretty high. We were hoping to get -- set
24 our target up to 50 percent -- is where it is this
25 year as our target, and that's the same target we

1 have had for the last few years. Last year's data
2 was at 44.24 percent, and again, we're still
3 analyzing our data to determine where it is this
4 year. Since we got fewer response rates, we're
5 having to go back in and look at some of that
6 data.

7 But for the last few years, our data
8 has been anywhere between 42 to 46 percent. We
9 have not quite reached that 50 percent, but we
10 have maintained a rate of mid-40 percent, if you
11 will, for the last few years. So we are still
12 looking at some different ways. One of the things
13 we were talking about is looking at what other
14 states are doing. Many states have changed their
15 survey to only include ten questions to make it
16 easier for parents to respond rather than having
17 them respond to a 25-item survey, and they've just
18 done different things and different ways, allowed
19 them to respond to the survey electronically in
20 their own website program that they have
21 [inaudible].

22 So we are looking this year at some
23 different things, and we'll be looking to you
24 [inaudible] this indicator for the next year's
25 report about any changes we might want to make to

1 our survey and those kinds of things. But at this
2 point, we are -- this is where we are. Our target
3 is 50 percent, and we have pretty much maintained
4 that mid 42 to 46 percent rate over the last five
5 years. This past year, it was 44.24 percent.

6 Indicator 14, there's 14a, 14b, and
7 14c. These are our postschool outcomes. Our
8 postschool outcomes are related to students who
9 have exited school through either graduating,
10 dropping out, aging out, or some other way in that
11 manner. That they are no longer in special
12 education and they have exited and been out of
13 school for one year, and we look at three
14 different areas in this area.

15 Higher ed is Indicator 14a, and so we
16 are looking at students who have been out of
17 school for one year or out of special education as
18 they exited the program maybe or, again, graduated
19 or dropped out or aged out. They've been out of
20 school for one year, and we are looking to see if
21 they are participating or have participated in
22 higher ed, and there are certain criteria.

23 They have to have attended at least a
24 full semester or be enrolled for a full semester
25 and taking a certain amount of classes, and they

1 have to be in a -- when we say "higher ed," that
2 is limited to a two-year or a four-year degree or
3 program.

4 So our baseline data in 2009 when
5 they -- they changed this indicator a little
6 bit -- so our baseline data started in 2009 -- we
7 had 39 percent of our students in that higher ed
8 category, and our baseline -- so we had to have
9 our baseline higher than that or our target higher
10 than the baseline. So our target is at 40
11 percent, but after that first year, we didn't
12 reach our target. We didn't even reach our
13 baseline.

14 And our data for last year -- and,
15 again, we're still analyzing the data -- is at
16 27.01 percent for last year. As I'm analyzing the
17 data, I feel like it's going to be similar. We've
18 been in the 20 percentile area for this indicator
19 for the last couple of years, and one of the
20 reasons is we're seeing an increase in our other
21 indicators, and I'll explain that in just a
22 minute.

23 But one change that we did make --
24 again, we used to contract this out and a call
25 center from New York used to call students who had

1 exited, and two years ago, we changed this and we
2 are training our districts and they are have their
3 own personnel contact these students.

4 And it has increased our response
5 rate from -- last year, it increased it from about
6 a 13 percent response rate to a 45 percent
7 response rate. And this year, I haven't
8 calculated the response rate yet, but we -- I can
9 tell we have more surveys or interviews that were
10 completed. So I'm anticipating that our response
11 rate is going to be somewhere between 45 and 50
12 percent, which is an excellent response rate
13 considering.

14 And we attribute that to the fact
15 that students are just getting a call from an
16 800-number they I don't recognize. We've had
17 teachers tell us they track their students better
18 on social media. They see them in the grocery
19 store and set up a time to do the interviews with
20 them. Or just when they're calling from the
21 school district, the students see that they're
22 getting a call or the parents see they're getting
23 a call from the school district, so they're
24 feeling comfortable responding to their own school
25 district, people they know from their past

1 experience as opposed to a call center with an
2 800-number. And I don't know if any of you are
3 like me, but when I see an unknown call coming in
4 [inaudible] I wait for them to leave a message and
5 see if should call them back or not, but anyway.

6 Indicator 14b is students who have
7 either completed that higher ed component or are
8 competitively employed one year out. And
9 competitive employment includes certain criteria
10 like working at least 20 hours a week, getting
11 paid minimum wage, and working for at least a
12 period of 90 days or more. So there are some set
13 criteria for competitive employment.

14 So Indicator 14b includes students
15 who were in higher ed and those students who are
16 also competitively employed. So it's a plus b or
17 a plus competitive employment equals b, if you
18 will. However, if a student is in higher ed and
19 is also competitively employed, they are only
20 counted one time in 14b. They're not counted
21 twice. So each student is only counted once.

22 Our data -- our baseline data in 2009
23 was 62 percent. We set our target is 63 percent.
24 We haven't met our target, but you can see we're a
25 little bit higher than our baseline. We're at

1 62.83 percent, and we are very close to our target
2 in that area where students are competitively
3 employed or attending higher ed one year out.

4 And these are students who actually
5 respond to the survey. That's why the response
6 rate is so important to us. When we were only
7 getting ten to 13 percent of students who were
8 actually responding to the interviews, we didn't
9 feel our data was as strong as it should be, and
10 we wanted to find out from more students.

11 14c in the postschool outcomes is a
12 combination of higher ed which is a, competitive
13 employment which is b, or other education and
14 training. So they can be in a vocation
15 rehabilitation training program or some other type
16 of community college training program that's not a
17 two-year program, or some other type of
18 employment, and it could be things like -- in
19 this instance, it can include students who are
20 self-employed, students who work for their
21 family's business like on a farm or in a family
22 store of some sort.

23 And while those things -- self-
24 employment and working for your family's business,
25 in some instances, in my mind, might be

1 competitive employment, it is not considered
2 competitive employment for this purpose. And I
3 will tell you, in analyzing that data when I look
4 at it, I do see a lot of students who are
5 self-employed. There are some kids who have their
6 own landscape companies and do that kind of
7 business or work in their parents' -- on their
8 parents' farm and they're eventually going to be
9 the person who's going to be running the farm kind
10 of thing. Those are some of things they've
11 reported to us in this data.

12 But, anyway, it's a combination of
13 all of those. So at the time back in 2009, we
14 were at 73 percent, and our target for that area
15 was 74 percent, but you can see we have exceeded
16 that target. So when you add in those other
17 things, we do have several students who have gone
18 through some kind of an education training program
19 for a particular job, but that doesn't count as
20 higher education. Or they've gone through a
21 vocational rehabilitation training program so that
22 they could seek employment, and that's counted in
23 this area but not in higher ed.

24 So you can see our previous year's
25 data was 77.70 percent, and that has been our --

1 that was our highest rate, but we were at -- the
2 previous year, I think we were at 75 or 76
3 percent. We were higher than our target the
4 previous year as well. So we do have a lot of
5 students reporting in that area, and we were
6 pleased to see that we were maintaining these
7 percentage rates. The only one we didn't was that
8 higher education that requires the two-year or the
9 four-year program. But that we maintain these
10 rates when we increase the number of students
11 responding because sometimes you'll see your
12 numbers go down, and we've seen ours either
13 maintaining or increasing the rates in Indicators
14 14b and 14c. So we're pleased with that change
15 that we've made.

16 And then Indicators 15 and 16, again,
17 these are our resolution sessions with settlement
18 agreements and mediations with mediation
19 agreements. So we look at all of the data that we
20 have related to if somebody has filed for a due
21 process, then they are offered a resolution
22 session. We look to see how many of those
23 sessions ended in settlement agreements and the
24 then same for mediation. Of all the mediations
25 that are done as a result of a due process or

1 prior to a due process or if due process was never
2 requested but a mediation occurred, we look to see
3 how many resulted in mediation agreements.

4 We are allowed to have ranges. Back
5 in 2005, our data for resolution sessions was 86
6 percent and our data for mediations was 71
7 percent. So you can see they were fairly high
8 back in 2005. We did set -- you can see our
9 targets. We did set a range that anywhere from 75
10 to 85 percent based those rates, and we were
11 allowed to set a range that was lower in this
12 instance than our baseline for resolution
13 sessions.

14 Our data for this year for resolution
15 sessions that ended in settlement agreements is
16 fairly low. It's at 34.21 percent. Our mediation
17 agreements is at -- mediations that ended in
18 written agreements is 62.6 percent. It's a little
19 bit higher, but it is still not -- neither of them
20 are at our target. I can tell you each year our
21 data seems to change. Some years we have met our
22 targets, and other years we have not met this
23 range of targets, and I think it probably depends
24 on individual instances of cases.

25 We don't necessarily have to -- we

1 don't have any control over those cases as a party
2 between a parent and the school system and what
3 they're attempting to resolve. I will say in
4 resolution sessions -- and this is my opinion, but
5 I would think it is a little bit harder to reach a
6 settlement agreement because by that time, one
7 party has filed for due process and communication
8 often has broken down, and there are issues that
9 people want to have the courts decide for them.

10 With mediation agreements, sometimes
11 they've gone to due process already but decided to
12 do a mediation, but we do have many requests for
13 mediation before a due process is ever requested.
14 So we do tend to see more settlements with written
15 agreements through the mediation process because
16 the communication might not be -- maybe hasn't
17 broken down quite as much, or people feel like
18 through a mediator they can resolve this without
19 having to go to court. The majority of people, I
20 would say, or most people don't want to go to
21 court to resolve their differences, and so when
22 they do go through mediation, that often works
23 better than going to a resolution session.

24 That is where our data is with these.
25 Again, we can have a range, and we preferred the

1 range in the past because, like I said, this is
2 one area where our data fluctuates so much, and it
3 just depends on whatever the issues [inaudible]
4 people who file for either due process or
5 mediation.

6 Our last target where we have to set
7 a target -- and this target won't be submitted
8 until we submit April 1st for our -- with our
9 SSIP, but it is our Indicator 17, and it is our
10 five-year cohort graduation rate. Our baseline
11 data for our five-year rate was at 67.82 percent,
12 and this was new back in 2013. It wasn't as long
13 as -- again, I had mentioned that this is our
14 fifth year of submitting our SSIP plan.

15 And so our baseline in 2013 was at
16 that almost 68 percent. Our target at the time --
17 we did projections out based on what we were
18 seeing in the graduation rate, so our target for
19 this year is 76.12 percent. I will tell you, in
20 previous years, we have met our targets. They
21 were lower because we projected them out, but our
22 data for this year's -- for the five-year cohort
23 rate is at 72.5 percent, and that is a drop of
24 about one and a half percentage points, not
25 exactly. I don't have the exact number here, but

1 it did drop from the previous year.

2 Not only did our five-year drop, our
3 four-year rate had dropped the previous year as
4 well, and some of the business rules around how
5 graduation rates are calculated with students with
6 disabilities have changed, and we're analyzing
7 that data to see if that impacted our rate because
8 I will tell you that we had more students who
9 could graduate numberwise and we graduated more
10 students. We had approximately 2500 more students
11 who graduated, and we graduated approximately 1600
12 more students, but based on the numbers, our
13 percentage rate dropped, even though we were
14 graduating more students, based on how the formula
15 works.

16 So we are still analyzing that data
17 to figure it out -- the drop -- what caused that
18 slippage, but as you can see, we have not met our
19 target for this current year. Again, as with all
20 the other targets, we can either recommend that we
21 maintain for this one year or we increase for one
22 year, and then keep in mind that we'll be setting
23 these targets again for the next six years next
24 year when we do more projections for that.

25 Okay. I still do have a few minutes.

1 Before we go on to the next slide, I would like to
2 see if there are any questions about those
3 targets. And as I'm saying that, there's a date
4 on there about when I need you to submit or email
5 your recommendations to me. If I can get those by
6 January 15th so that I can consider all those with
7 the other stakeholder input that we're getting
8 from other groups so that we can finalize what our
9 targets will be because we do have to submit this
10 document on February 3rd.

11 We will send out -- the handout that
12 you got, you can certainly write on that and mark
13 on that, but we will send that out to you
14 electronically so you can fill it out and email
15 back it to us electronically.

16 Are there any questions related to
17 this information?

18 MS. MOOREFIELD: This is Ginny
19 Moorefield speaking. I actually have a couple of
20 questions, but I wanted to first -- before I take
21 up Nancy's time, are we going to discuss this
22 as---

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I was planning on
24 discussing this during our -- probably our
25 committee time because this is---

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: This falls perfectly
2 into Cynthia and I -- this is exactly what we
3 have---

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. I just needed
5 some kind of expounding on things because I'm not
6 so much thinking clearly today, so I just needed
7 like -- you know, but I didn't want to take up
8 Nancy's time if we're going to all be discussing
9 it.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: I've seen where our
11 virtual meetings don't always work out very well,
12 and so I'd rather discuss this in person and get
13 it done.

14 MS. MOOREFIELD: All right.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: But I don't know if
16 I'm going to be the chair after lunch, so you
17 might need to take it up with---

18 MS. HUTCHINSON: The last time our
19 Reports and Data team got together, this is
20 exactly what we talked about making
21 recommendations.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: So if you don't want
24 to spend time as a whole group, that's probably
25 what we're going to spend out committee time

1 talking about. It's up to you.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll figure that
3 out during lunch. How's that sound?

4 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Sure.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: But, yeah,
6 definitely, I want to bring this up, you know,
7 today before the whole Council to make a final
8 approval of our recommendation on this. But you
9 had questions for Nancy?

10 MS. MOOREFIELD: Well, that's what I
11 was saying. I wanted to see if we were going to
12 discuss it because I didn't want to take up
13 Nancy's time for like basic explanation, which is
14 what a lot of my questions deal with.

15 And then, Nancy, if I could -- if any
16 of my questions don't get answered when we discuss
17 this as a Council, I can just email them to you,
18 right?

19 DR. JOHNSON: Yes. If you-all have
20 any questions that don't get answered today, you
21 can email me; or if you would like to me to do
22 another call with you at some point, we can do
23 that to answer any questions; or if you-all send
24 me questions, I can put things in writing and send
25 them back out so the whole Council has the answers

1 to the questions.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: That sounds great.

3 DR. JOHNSON: And I do think -- and I
4 think I heard you say this, but I didn't hear what
5 everybody said. I think you might be discussing
6 this further in your committees, and if you are,
7 that might be a good time to come up with any
8 questions that you might have that you can send to
9 me as a group, and then I can respond back to that
10 as well. But I'm happy to answer any questions I
11 can right now as well.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Any other
13 questions? Anybody online? I can't see that, but
14 no one's asked any questions?

15 MS. UTZ: There's no questions.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Folks, who
17 are listening online, if you have any questions,
18 please just kind of write in the comment block
19 that "I have a question," and we will try to get
20 to you on that, just so that's known. I have a
21 question, but I'm sure we can figure that out in
22 the Data Committee so -- because it's about
23 proficiency rates for nondisabled students to see
24 how we're comparing with our nondisabled---

25 MS. HUTCHINSON: And they don't have

1 like an apples-to-apples comparison because, like
2 Nancy said, they don't have the 21 targets that
3 line up with like ours.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Exactly. But we
5 still have all of the end-of-year testing that we
6 have to do anyway.

7 MS. HUTCHINSON: Sure. Sure.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: That would give us
9 an idea of proficiency.

10 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's just they're
11 not following the same business rules.

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: This is Ginny
13 Moorefield again, Nancy. I did have one kind of
14 overall question for several of these indicators.
15 So the data that is collected, are there -- like
16 are there breakdowns or categories for either
17 various disabilities or varying severity of
18 disabilities when you guys measure this?

19 DR. JOHNSON: It depends on the
20 categories of what we're looking at and not
21 typically. Like, for example, graduation rates,
22 they collect that data based on students with
23 disabilities only, and it is not broken down by
24 category of disability. I do believe that we
25 can -- it would be [inaudible] list, but we could

1 go in and look at student ID numbers to
2 determine -- to try to match that. We had to do
3 that one time when we looking at the SSIP data,
4 but that is extra work on folks' part to get that
5 data together.

6 We have been told that with our new
7 ECATS accountability system, and not for this
8 year, but at some point in the future, that we are
9 going to be able to break down our data based on
10 disability categories easier and that we will be
11 able to start reporting some data that way. But
12 right now at this time, we don't have that data,
13 and again, I will tell you we were a bit surprised
14 that they OSEP was having us set this target for
15 this year. So we didn't preparations done like we
16 do for next -- we know next year that we're going
17 to be setting targets for the next six years, and
18 we're going to start analyzing our data and
19 looking at trend data. So we will be trying to
20 break it down a little bit differently.

21 But because we were just notified
22 back in -- back in late October that we were going
23 have to set these targets, we did not have time to
24 do what we normally would do to recommend setting
25 targets, and that's why OSEP told us as long as

1 our numbers are higher than our baseline, if you
2 want to maintain your target for one year, knowing
3 you're going to be setting these targets for six
4 years, that could be an option for you.

5 MS. MOOREFIELD: The indicators that
6 I was mainly looking at for where information like
7 that would be helpful would be with the
8 assessments like the state standardized
9 assessments and placement and the postschool
10 outcomes because I felt like -- as you were
11 talking, I wondered if the data reflected a kid
12 with a mild -- you know, a mild learning
13 disability versus a kid with severe cognitive and
14 severe physical disabilities because those -- I
15 mean that's apples and oranges.

16 And I wondered if all kids were --
17 you know, were being lumped in together to get
18 those statistics or if there -- you know, maybe it
19 just wasn't on this sheet -- that you guys had
20 looked at kind of those severity levels and how
21 that affected the data.

22 DR. JOHNSON: Yeah. No. And when we
23 look at students with disabilities, it includes
24 all students. So it is not -- so kids with
25 significant cognitive disabilities are included in

1 the data. So we don't break the data out -- the
2 data is not broken out by how many of them or what
3 percentage of them are students with more
4 significant cognitive disabilities versus low
5 incidence areas like visually impaired or hearing
6 impaired or anything like that.

7 Now we do have some of that data and
8 we do collect that data for like the postschool
9 outcomes. We do know which disability category at
10 least based on what the student has reported that
11 they were classified as or what their parent -- if
12 their parent is answering the survey. So we do
13 have some of that data, and I do some of that in
14 the writeup, but I just haven't finished analyzing
15 that yet.

16 But, again, all students are included
17 and not -- in the data. So it's not like students
18 with significant cognitive disabilities have been
19 excluded from any of this data, if that's what
20 you're asking. I'm not---

21 MS. MOOREFIELD: No, I wasn't asking
22 about exclusion, but I'm asking about like, you
23 know, if I'm looking at -- you know, if I'm
24 looking at these proficiency rates on state
25 assessments, well, you know, if you're measuring a

1 child like mine against a child who is -- maybe
2 has just visually impairment, that's not -- that
3 doesn't -- you know, lumping that wide of a range
4 means that, you know, this 56.4 percent doesn't
5 really tell us much of anything.

6 DR. JOHNSON: Okay. Now it does
7 include -- the proficiency rates that we report
8 include students who have taken alternate
9 assessments also, and we could break out by -- we
10 don't have to for this report, but we could go
11 back, when we get our data, and break it out by
12 alternate assessments and our regular assessments
13 and our regular assessments with accommodations.

14 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. That's what I
15 was asking.

16 DR. JOHNSON: But we do report the
17 data that way to OSEP, so we could report that
18 data out, but that is not -- what we've reported
19 here is how we have to report it in this report,
20 but we could give you that data. But I won't have
21 that data until January.

22 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. All right.
23 That's what I was asking because I didn't want --
24 I didn't want district programs to be penalized
25 if -- you know, if this report goes in and it

1 looks like they have a low stat number, and it's
2 because, you know, it's this huge range of
3 abilities being measured at one time. So, yeah,
4 that does help.

5 DR. JOHNSON: So I can -- for the
6 proficiency and participation rates, we can report
7 it out that way. For graduation rates and things
8 like that, I cannot report this type of data at
9 this point in time.

10 MS. MOOREFIELD: And graduation rate,
11 that does include like kids who are on -- who are
12 on like the OCS or who are on, you know, like the
13 alternative programs that may not necessarily be
14 getting a diploma but -- yeah, a diploma, but just
15 that they have successfully completed the K-12
16 program, right?

17 DR. JOHNSON: No. The graduation
18 rate is required by the definition and by OSEP's
19 requirements that it be students who have received
20 a standard high school diploma. So a student who
21 has done the OCS curriculum, if they have received
22 a standard high school diploma when they
23 graduate -- if they graduate in four years with
24 their cohort or in five years with their cohort,
25 they would be reported in that four- or five-year

1 cohort rate.

2 But if they don't receive a standard
3 high school diploma, they are not a part of that
4 rate. That whole indicator -- both of those
5 indicators are about students who have received a
6 standard high school diploma.

7 MR. HOSKINS: And just to clarify,
8 Nancy, they're included in the denominator of that
9 but not the numerator, correct?

10 DR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Matt.
11 Thank you for clarifying that. They are included
12 in the denominator with their cohort group, but
13 they are not included in the numerator.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. I don't
15 believe there's any more questions. So let's move
16 on to the next part of your presentation.

17 DR. JOHNSON: Okay. Just real
18 quickly, and I know I'm out of my time, but the
19 rest of the slides are more similar to what we
20 used to present on, and it just shows the rates if
21 we have them already -- some of them, we don't
22 have yet -- for all the compliance indicators, and
23 these targets are already set. For example,
24 Indicator 4b is about districts that have a
25 significant discrepancy related to long-term

1 suspensions and expulsions, and it's due to not
2 meeting regulatory requirements. The districts in
3 question, we determined it was not due to that,
4 and so we are at zero percent, which is the
5 required target, as an example.

6 And we can just quickly go through
7 these. I'll show you these. 9 and 10 is about
8 disproportionate representation due to
9 inappropriate identification. You can see the
10 numbers for Indicator 9 is about all special
11 education, and Indicator 10 is about six specific
12 disability categories including autism, specific
13 learning disabilities, speech-language impaired,
14 intellectual disability mild, serious emotional
15 disability, and other health impaired.

16 And you can see the 2018-19 data. We
17 had six LEAs overall for all students -- all
18 special education, and in none of those LEAs was
19 it due to inappropriate identification. And then
20 in Indicator 10, we had 58 LEAs in the specific
21 category areas. We are still reviewing that data
22 to determine, but these, again, are indicators
23 that are supposed to be -- we're supposed to have
24 zero percent of our LEAs in that column 2 that it
25 was due to inappropriate identification. We might

1 have the discrepancy, but as long as it's not due
2 to not following regulations.

3 I will tell you this increase partly
4 relates to we have more LEAs included that have
5 white students in the area autism and the area of
6 other health impaired that are showing -- showing
7 disproportionate representation based on their
8 white population in those two categories. So
9 that's one of the reasons our numbers have
10 increased.

11 Another reason, we have more charter
12 schools this year on the list than we have had in
13 past years as charter schools are getting more
14 students. Some charter schools have said that
15 those students came to me from another district,
16 they were already identified, and our population
17 and enrollment is a little bit different than a
18 district's enrollment. But what we do share with
19 them is that in looking at these numbers that it
20 is a comparison to your district's enrollment. So
21 it's not comparing you to some other district's
22 enrollment.

23 But we are still analyzing those 58
24 LEAs to see if it had to do with inappropriately
25 identifying students, in other words, not using

1 the eligibility criteria correctly as they
2 identified students. So that's where we are with
3 that one, and again, that's at zero percent.

4 The next slide is about our placement
5 timelines. Indicator 11, the 2018-19 data, right
6 now, we are at 88.99 percent, and that's our
7 90-day timeline. I will tell you that that is
8 lower than we have ever been. For the first time
9 ever, we're below 90 percent, but this data -- I
10 want to share with you this data right now, from
11 my perspective, we're considering this a draft
12 because up until we submit in February, we can
13 look at our data and clean it if we need to.

14 We do find sometimes there are -- we
15 do give districts an opportunity to correct their
16 data. We'll go in and see that they entered a
17 wrong date and that threw things off or there's
18 something in the program that throws things off,
19 or we could go in and find out that yes, they
20 actually did meet this timeline, and for some
21 reason it didn't calculate right.

22 So we are still reviewing a few
23 districts in that vein so this rate may go up a
24 little bit. It won't go any lower. This is the
25 lowest it will be, but we're required to be at 100

1 percent for Indicator 11 and we're required to be
2 at 100 percent for Indicator 12. Indicator 12 is
3 89.60 percent, and this is the second year it's
4 been below 90 percent. We have in the past few
5 years had a relatively high percentage rate, but
6 this was an increase from the previous year.

7 And what we were finding in this area
8 is that some districts changed their process for
9 how they were implementing this process and
10 ensuring they were determining children's
11 eligibility as they [inaudible] Part C to Part B
12 and getting their IEPs developed by age three, and
13 when they changed their process for actually doing
14 process, it caused them not to meet their
15 timeline. The districts have improved in that,
16 but not quite as much as they need to, so we're
17 still working with them to improve their processes
18 to get them back on track for the timeline. But
19 that was an increase in that rate.

20 On Indicator 13, we're still looking
21 at this data. The last few years, we have been
22 about at 85 percent. Again, this is a requirement
23 to be at 100 percent, and these are children who
24 are age 16 and above, that they had their
25 measurable postsecondary goals, that they were

1 updated appropriately related to transition data
2 and services.

3 We have found that we have variances
4 across our state, and we do [inaudible] our
5 monitoring consultants monitor about a fifth of
6 our school districts each year, and they review
7 IEPs for this area for Indicator 13, and again,
8 the last three or four years, we've been right
9 about 85 percent. This is, again, an indicator
10 that should be 100 percent.

11 The area where we seem to have the
12 most difficulty with this area is writing
13 appropriate measurable postsecondary goals. They
14 seem to do all the other components. We get a lot
15 of technical assistance from our National
16 Technical Assistance Center which is located at
17 UNC Charlotte, and they have a checklist that
18 states use to do this indicator.

19 And that area of measurable
20 postsecondary goals is what IEP teams seem to
21 struggle with the most in terms of focusing on
22 what kids are going to do once they leave school
23 and having that goal be measurable. So we're
24 still working on a lot of training in that area
25 for districts.

1 And I anticipate, as I look at the
2 data -- I haven't finished analyzing it yet, but
3 as I look at the data, we're probably going to be,
4 again, somewhere near that 85 percent rate. I
5 doubt that it will be higher. I would love for it
6 to be higher, but I doubt that it will be. That
7 was it for those indicators.

8 Thank you for giving me that little
9 bit of extra time to share those with you as well.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Nancy.
11 Were there any more questions? One of our guests
12 had a question.

13 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: Should I just ask
14 from here?

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do the mike so that
16 Nancy can hear you. She's online.

17 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: Hello. I'm [name
18 redacted]. A couple of questions I have. I'm
19 sorry. Is it Nancy? I don't know who I'm talking
20 to.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Nancy, yes.

22 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: First of all, with
23 the alternative assessment given that was being
24 referenced that's not separated, the alternative
25 assessment is created in order to basically even

1 the playing fields so that really it's
2 accommodations that those children should be
3 scoring at a much higher level, is that -- I mean
4 like the alternative test that's given, the whole
5 purpose of that test is to be able to measure what
6 the students know.

7 And so whether they're given the
8 alternative test or the regular test, don't you
9 think that the benchmark or the expectant
10 performance of these children -- like fifty-some
11 percent, that's failing, that's low. And if
12 you're looking at an alternative test, they should
13 be doing much higher.

14 My son, you know, at 16,
15 high-functioning autistic, dyslexic, dysgraphic,
16 everything, and we cannot continue to keep our
17 standards so low for these children. I refused
18 to, and my son is now performing at his ability
19 level, which is above grade level now.

20 The whole purpose of the IDEA when it
21 was rewritten in 2004 -- I believe the findings in
22 14C, I believe it's Section 4, it talks about how
23 our country -- the reason IDEA was not working
24 from the original law in 1976 -- don't quote me on
25 that date -- is that we kept our standards and our

1 expectations so low for children with special
2 needs. In 2004, Congress had findings based on
3 science. The reading panel was there, right?
4 People were there based on science saying that
5 these children can learn. They can not only
6 learn, they can thrive.

7 Why are the standards so low,
8 considering in 2004 they used science -- 30 years
9 of science -- now it's about 45 years of
10 science -- that shows that these children can have
11 their brains rewired, neurobiologically rewired
12 through pretty simple measures. I just -- I don't
13 understand why we are like shooting for a 50
14 percent and like, you know, applauding these kids
15 that get jobs cutting someone's yard. These
16 children should have the same ability to get a job
17 and do whatever they want to do.

18 We have the bar so low. I just moved
19 here a year and a half ago from Pennsylvania, and
20 I am sad and disgusted with how the state treats
21 children who have special needs. There's a lot
22 more children than is even identified. The way
23 North Carolina identifies children is not in
24 compliance with federal law, and there are many,
25 many more children who can be taught appropriately

1 using science and thrive.

2 My journey, which I will talk about
3 later with you-all so hopefully you can learn what
4 I learned, is that all children can learn. We
5 have mission statements in our schools and hanging
6 on the walls how all children can learn, all
7 children can succeed, all children should be able
8 to do what they want to do, and then we're saying
9 that we should celebrate someone cutting someone's
10 yard.

11 My son, in third grade, was
12 basically -- I was told, "You know what? Good
13 luck --" if he was going to be able to read. He
14 just finished a Coursera class, a college-level
15 class with a 96 percent, independently by himself
16 because I spent \$40,000 getting him research-based
17 interventions. So he is no longer dyslexic, he is
18 no longer dysgraphic, and his autism -- you know,
19 that's a lot of comorbidities. He's a little
20 quirky, but that kid has opportunity.

21 We need to give every child in the
22 state of North Carolina equal opportunity, and we
23 are not, and that is a disgrace, having the
24 numbers so low that Congress in 2004 said that we
25 can't do it. We are collecting federal dollars --

1 are we not? -- and we are not in compliance with
2 federal law. Our children deserve better. Those
3 numbers should be changed and need to be changed.
4 And I have a whole plan that I would love to share
5 with you later.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

7 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: But I don't know
8 if she -- I mean that was a question. I'm sorry.
9 I have a problem going into a dissertation, so---

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

11 DR. JOHNSON: This is Nancy, and Matt
12 may want to respond. I do have two things I do
13 need to respond to so that you understand what we
14 are reporting on. This APR only reports on some
15 of our data. For the proficiency rates that
16 are -- the targets right now are at 56 percent, I
17 believe. We might have to go back and look at the
18 slide. Those are for our highest levels 4 and 5
19 of our assessments, which are college and career
20 ready.

21 But we also -- we choose to report on
22 those kids who meet our statewide proficiency,
23 which is level 3, which says that they are meeting
24 the statewide -- they're proficient in the
25 statewide curriculum, but we only report on

1 those -- those two highest levels. So it does not
2 include all of our kids who are considered
3 proficient. So that target -- that is one thing.
4 I know that doesn't totally address your concern.

5 And we do share with you that we --
6 it is very important that we have high
7 expectations for all students, and our SSIP,
8 Indicator 17, is a lot about improving outcomes
9 for all students with disabilities. But related
10 to that, those targets are what our state
11 submitted in our ESSA plan, our Elementary and
12 Secondary plan, for all students, and while we can
13 have different indicators or different targets on
14 here, we would need to explain why our targets are
15 different than what the US Department of Education
16 has approved for our ESSA plan. That's one thing.

17 And then one other thing, when I
18 mentioned that the students were included
19 Indicator 14c, I did not mean to imply that we
20 should just assume that our kids can just cut
21 grass, and if I did that, I'm sorry. I didn't
22 mean to offend anyone. What I was sharing in
23 there is that there are students who are quite
24 successful. They started their own landscaping
25 businesses, and they've explained that, and that's

1 not -- but it's not -- they've hired employees who
2 work for them, but that's not considered
3 competitive employment in these definitions. Yet,
4 those students are quite successful because
5 they're running their own business and they're
6 paying employees.

7 So if you misunderstood what I was
8 saying when I commented about that one, I'm sorry.
9 It's hard when you're here on a webinar, and I'm
10 not able to engage directly with folks. So with
11 that, I do hear what you're saying and we do want
12 all of our districts to have high expectations for
13 all students. We do at the state level.

14 And I understand now, since I heard
15 Matt's voice, that he is there. So he may want to
16 address that a little bit more or not. So thank
17 you.

18 MS. MOOREFIELD: This is Ginny
19 Moorefield. I just need to say that as a regular
20 ed teacher, I have a couple of students that when
21 they graduated, they did mow yards and I'm darn
22 proud of them.

23 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: There's nothing
24 wrong with mowing a yard, but we don't want that
25 as their only option. If they choose that, great,

1 but we want them to have options. That's what I
2 was saying.

3 MR. HOSKINS: I just want to
4 reiterate really what Nancy said. When I think
5 about the intent, the vision, the spirit of IDEA,
6 it's around results, it's around outcomes for
7 students with disabilities. I will not be
8 satisfied until we see students with disabilities
9 performing as proficiently as nondisabled
10 students.

11 With that said, I think we also have
12 to hold high expectations, ambitious expectations
13 in what we know, through research and
14 implementation science, are ambitious goals that
15 can be met over time. At the Department of Public
16 Instruction and the Exception Children's Division,
17 that is a lot of the work that we're doing on the
18 SSIP right now is examining if students are
19 meeting IEP goals and are they also meeting
20 proficiency goals and why or why not, and do we
21 need to ensure that IEP goals are directly tied to
22 proficiency goals because that's our ultimate goal
23 for students with disabilities.

24 So we are certainly holding ourselves
25 accountable based on results and know the

1 critical, critical importance of having high
2 expectations for students with disabilities. But
3 I appreciate your comments. I also wanted to
4 address -- the first question, I think, you had
5 that I don't know that we addressed, the alternate
6 assessments are based on the Extended Content
7 Standards. So they are based on the standards
8 that students should be meeting with significant
9 cognitive disabilities---

10 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: The level should
11 be the same of a nondisabled child.

12 MR. HOSKINS: I don't know if it's an
13 apples-to-apples comparison, but they are being
14 held accountable to standards that they are being
15 instructed upon, just as nondisabled or students
16 that are on the standard course of study are.

17 MR. BAKER: Standard course of study.

18 MS. MOOREFIELD: This is Ginny
19 Moorefield again. My son is also on the extend,
20 and I bring in my notebook for every IEP meeting
21 when we set those goals because I do not want him
22 in a glorified daycare. He has the ability to
23 learn, and I want him to be pushed to learn. So
24 the extend standards, they do parallel the common
25 core standards, but whereas like common core may

1 have in standard 3 for science, whatever, you
2 know, common core may have six items there, six
3 objectives and the extend may have two or three.
4 So it's the same topics -- like it's the same
5 topics that are being discussed and that are being
6 learned; it's just -- it makes it a little bit
7 more attainable and it gives the teacher a little
8 bit more wiggle room about how in-depth they want
9 to go with a specific concept and how much that
10 child can be required to demonstrate after that.

11 But the topics and the concepts are
12 pretty much the same. It's just how you get there
13 and how in-depth with it you get that is the
14 difference.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Any other questions
16 for Nancy while we have her? There's another
17 guest in the back. Let's try to keep it brief and
18 focus on the question that you have so that we
19 can---

20 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: This is a very
21 simple question. My name is [name redacted]. I'm
22 one of the people sitting back here in the
23 audience, Nancy. Good morning.

24 DR. JOHNSON: Good morning.

25 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: I'm asking about

1 number 8, parent involvement survey. I'm
2 wondering what the mode of delivery may be with
3 that. I am a parent. I've had a kid on an IEP
4 for three years now, and I have never received a
5 survey.

6 DR. JOHNSON: Yes. It is possible
7 that you would not receive a survey. They are
8 done through a sampling plan. All of our
9 districts, except our large five districts, are
10 only in the sampling plan once every five years.
11 So it's possible your district has not been
12 surveyed yet, and it is not all of the parents
13 that are surveyed per district.

14 It is based on a random sample that's
15 calculated through a calculator that we were
16 provided to come up with a random sample based on
17 the percentage of students based on different
18 categories of disability, based on gender, and
19 based on age. So many go out for kids who are in
20 elementary school and so many go out for kids who
21 are in high school and that kind of thing. So it
22 is possible that you have not been or will not be
23 surveyed because all parents are not surveyed.

24 However, that is one thing over the
25 next year, as we consider making changes to the

1 survey, that we could consider -- some states do
2 what they call a consensus and they allow any
3 parent of a student with a disability in each year
4 that they do this, they allow them to respond to
5 the survey because they do it through their own
6 department website. So that is something we are
7 looking at, how other states are doing it and what
8 changes they've made to allow for that to happen.

9 So if that is something that the
10 Council and other stakeholders think is important
11 for us to consider, we will consider that in our
12 deliberations over the next year.

13 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: Okay. And let it
14 be noted this is the first meeting I've ever
15 attended so I was just curious. As a parent, I
16 would love to fill out one of your surveys, but
17 again, there is the possibility, based on the way
18 data collection is happening, that I may not see
19 one. Maybe I will see one in middle school or
20 high school.

21 DR. JOHNSON: Yes, that's a
22 possibility that you would see one over -- over
23 the five years of the time, but again -- and we
24 can share with you what the actual survey is. We
25 can share that with anybody and see that. That's

1 a part of our APR. So if you would like to email
2 me at my address, I can send you a copy of what
3 the survey looks like.

4 But, again, we are also -- it's a 25-
5 item survey, and that's one of the problems we've
6 had. It's a survey that's kind of lengthy, and we
7 have been told in other states where they've
8 changed to a ten-item survey that they're getting
9 a better response rate.

10 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: Awesome. Thank
11 you so much, Nancy, for answering my question.

12 DR. JOHNSON: You're quite welcome.
13 Thank you.

14 MS. HUTCHINSON: I was just going to
15 mentioned from a school perspective, it also
16 depends on when your child was placed and when
17 they pull that sampling. So after a certain date,
18 like if you were after December 1 or after April 1
19 and we were a district that was in that five-year
20 cycle and we were on our first year and let's say
21 your child was placed after December 1 or after
22 April 1, that might not come back around for five
23 years.

24 And just from my perspective -- and I
25 know there's like a strategic way -- if I have

1 students in low incidence populations like vision
2 impaired or traumatic brain injury or hearing
3 impaired, they typically always get selected
4 because the numbers are so small, and when I have
5 other students that are in areas like autism or
6 specific learning disability or other health
7 impaired, far less of my student's parents are
8 selected.

9 And then the other point I wanted to
10 make is that we get those letters -- I want to say
11 it's like right in the middle of EOG time. It's
12 May. And we get the delivery of the letters, and
13 then the local LEA has a choice of how they want
14 to send that out, and that could be different in
15 each school within the LEA.

16 So like many times, people would make
17 a decision that elementary school students do tend
18 to bring their backpacks home to mom and dad, so
19 they might just stuff those in the bags. And
20 sometimes we make decisions about middle school
21 and high school students that those would just
22 live in the bag and never come out to a parent, so
23 we might mail those.

24 So there's not a great answer as to
25 how you would actually receive it because it would

1 depend on, you know, what the district decided to
2 do about how to get that to you. So just a
3 thought.

4 DR. JOHNSON: Yeah. Was that Christy
5 Hutchinson speaking?

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: She caught you.

7 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: That does complete
8 the answer, and I really appreciate you taking the
9 time to answer that and respond back to me. And I
10 would be happy to increase those percentages, but
11 again, as a parent that doesn't receive it, I
12 can't help up those numbers for you.

13 DR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible].

14 MS. HUTCHINSON: And we don't have
15 the ability to help either because we just send it
16 out, so---

17 DR. JOHNSON: [Inaudible] districts
18 send that out and they send out based on
19 [inaudible], and it is based on our December 1
20 Child Count [inaudible] pulled randomly.

21 MS. GRANT: This is Christy Grant. I
22 think it's important to know too that we are sent
23 the names of the parents to send them to. So the
24 districts don't get to choose which parents to
25 send the surveys to. We do -- you know, we do our

1 own internal in-house surveys as well, but some
2 districts, that's just above and beyond. But the
3 names are sent to us.

4 MR. HOSKINS: Yeah. So the intent of
5 the survey -- we have to use sampling procedures
6 that are approved by the US Department of
7 Education that then allow us to generalize across
8 the state. So these are really across those kind
9 of big domains that we report to OSEP of how do we
10 develop a sampling strategy without having to
11 survey every single parent, which may be difficult
12 to do, and be able to generalize across the state.

13 So the types of surveys that Christy
14 was talking about that are done at the LEA level
15 give us a much more granular, potentially
16 qualitative way to analyze those data and be able
17 to picture the context of what's happening.

18 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: Yeah. I also
19 didn't give my additional background. I also do
20 substitute teach, so I do understand when you're
21 saying you're sending something in somebody's
22 backpack and it never comes back.

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: Or it comes back
24 along with a half-eaten peanut butter and jelly
25 sandwich.

1 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: Yeah. I tend to
2 sub in the same classes, so I understand what
3 you're saying. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

5 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's also nice to
6 know your LEA and decide -- like I don't know how
7 Christy does her survey, but we do ours
8 electronically because we're -- that's just where
9 we're located and how our parents have access, and
10 so we get a higher percentage rate when they know
11 whose email it's coming from because they have a
12 person connected with it, and then just knowing
13 your parents, how they're able to respond
14 electronically might serve certain populations and
15 not others.

16 But this is paper-pencil, and so I
17 just know from my population, if my name is not on
18 there or somebody within the district, it's going
19 right in the trash can unfortunately, and it's
20 paper-pencil so they are not always going to take
21 the effort. But if I was in Nancy's seat---

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Or find it a year
23 later.

24 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yeah. But if I was
25 in Nancy's seat, I couldn't make a decision for

1 the whole entire state that it go electronic
2 because I can't ensure that those folks -- that
3 I'm not setting a barrier of discrimination there.
4 So it's just -- you have to know your population,
5 I guess.

6 DR. JOHNSON: Yes. And, Christy, for
7 the first time this year, we did allow for an
8 electronic submission through a QR code on our
9 website, but we did find -- we had some parents
10 call us, and we found that parents were -- some
11 parents were having difficulty answering that. So
12 I agree with you. It depends on the parents
13 whether they prefer paper-pencil or an electronic
14 one.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: Nancy, I just had --
16 this is Ginny Moorefield -- I just had a question
17 about that same thing with the parent involvement.
18 Is there a -- like is there a mandated timeline
19 for responses?

20 DR. JOHNSON: No. Districts or
21 states can have that timeline set anywhere as long
22 as they get the data for one year and submit it
23 within the APR, which we have to submit by
24 February 1st. We've sent it out at different
25 times. Sometimes we -- we try to send it in the

1 spring and have it come back to us in the summer.
2 It depends on when districts get it out -- when we
3 get it to them and districts get it out.

4 I have been talking with other
5 states. I've learned one state opens theirs from
6 January to May, which is a different timeline, but
7 they're still getting the same -- they're asking
8 for the data for the same school year. So we are
9 looking, again, at those times. There is not a
10 set timeline. Whenever we get it out, then we put
11 a date when we need it back, and that kind of sets
12 the timeline for it.

13 That is another thing that we will be
14 considering because we bumped up against spring
15 break, and people said, "Oh, it came before spring
16 break and I forgot about it, so I didn't respond
17 to it," and just different things. Looking at
18 that timeline is an issue as well.

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: Because I was just
20 wondering, you know, like if it could be part of
21 that face-to-face IEP meeting where that survey is
22 put in the parent's hand.

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: Sometimes districts
24 do that. That's sometimes---

25 MS. MOOREFIELD: So I was just

1 wondering if there was like a time limit on it
2 like if it had to be back within six weeks of the
3 State sending it out or if it could be, you know,
4 that whole year to potentially catch people in
5 their annual review meetings that that could be
6 handed to them and maybe even completed -- I mean
7 if it's only ten to 15 questions on one sheet of
8 paper versus 25 different slides on an email, if
9 that could be completed, you know, of course, in
10 private, but while the parent is standing there.

11 DR. JOHNSON: That is something that
12 I guess we could consider. It might, though --
13 the way we get it out and get it out to folks --
14 especially when used a contractor -- we're not
15 using a contractor now. So we would have to look
16 at our timelines within DPI about getting the
17 information out and who needs to be -- who the
18 district is required to survey through a random
19 sample right now because we base it on the
20 December 1 Child Count for the year, and that's
21 not complete. [Inaudible] December 1 Child Count
22 and they've already had their annual review, we
23 might miss that meeting by the time we identify
24 that child for the district. So we would have to
25 think about how that might work.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Any more questions?
2 I'm actually going to put this down as a future
3 discussion that we can have at some other time to
4 discuss how we might want to change and impact
5 surveys, as it sounds like something that Nancy is
6 looking at doing it anyway, so we can definitely
7 have that discussion later.

8 Any other questions regarding what
9 was discussed this morning?

10 **(No audible response.)**

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. I know
12 we've gone over, but that's fine. Let's take
13 about a five-minute break for anybody who needs to
14 use the restroom or get up and stretch your legs
15 for a few minutes, and then we'll reconvene.

16 **(A brief recess was taken from 11:24**
17 **a.m. to 11:41 a.m.)**

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's comes back
19 and we will try to get through this next hour in
20 maybe 30 minutes. We'll see.

21 All right. On a serious note, next
22 on the agenda was Matt Hoskins.

23 MR. HOSKINS: I believe we've had
24 approval to shift the agenda slightly so I can go
25 ahead and do recommendation -- I mean -- not

1 recommendations, but updates at this point.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Updates and
3 everything else, yes.

4 MR. HOSKINS: So I'll go ahead and do
5 that first and then move on to the next part. My
6 name is Matt Hoskins. I'm the Assistant Director
7 here for the Exceptional Children Division at the
8 Department Public Instruction. I really
9 appreciate the opportunity to share some big
10 updates of what's been occurring at the Division
11 recently.

12 The first thing that I want to start
13 with is related to the policy around specific
14 learning disabilities. We have a policy addendum
15 that will be going into effect July 1st, 2020, and
16 we recently on December 2nd held a stakeholder
17 meeting to look specifically at some of the
18 language that is included in the current policy
19 that's already been passed by the State Board of
20 Education.

21 We have been getting some feedback
22 from various stakeholder groups. We have done
23 some thematic analysis of the technical assistance
24 questions that we were getting around the policy
25 itself, and so we knew that there might be some

1 slight language adjustments that we wanted to make
2 with that policy and knew that we needed to begin
3 addressing that now to make those adjustments
4 again in front of the State Board prior to that
5 July 1 date.

6 I felt like that meeting was very
7 successful. We had Council representation there.
8 What we did is, we brought people together. The
9 folks that were included, included the major
10 advocacy groups across the state. We had Learning
11 Disabilities Association. We had several groups
12 representing dyslexia. We also had institutes of
13 higher education. The entire task force that was
14 involved with developing the policy also attended
15 as well. We also had some DPI representation that
16 were on that initial task force.

17 Our role as DPI staff during that
18 meeting were really just to answer factual
19 questions, and if there were any clarifications
20 about potential intent or context of language that
21 was in the policy, we were there to answer that,
22 but we really didn't participate other than that
23 because we didn't want to influence the
24 conversation and discussion that was going on
25 around potential changes to the policy.

1 What we did is, we had folks break
2 into groups and talk about different areas of
3 concern that they had. Once we had them do that,
4 we had those groups share out. We came together
5 as a larger group to prioritize where those
6 concerns were. Then we actually jumped into the
7 policy itself and made recommended -- potential
8 recommended changes from that group that we will
9 now take back and consider implementing within
10 that policy.

11 So our timeline for that -- as we've
12 actually already gone through the recommendations
13 that were made from that group. Hopefully by the
14 end of the week, we will have that policy with any
15 strikethrough's, redlines, additions added to
16 that, send it out to stakeholder groups for review
17 so that we can get one more chance to get feedback
18 from stakeholders on the changes that were made
19 based on that meeting.

20 Once we get the feedback, make any
21 final modification, changes, technical corrections
22 that we need to make, get it to the rules
23 committee here, and get it in front of the State
24 Board, I'm thinking -- and I am ambitious, but a
25 timeline that we can follow is getting that to the

1 rules committee by February and to the State Board
2 by March. So I'm excited about that. I'm excited
3 about the policy itself and thought we had a
4 successful meeting there.

5 We also have an ongoing -- one of the
6 things that you'll see here that's a theme around
7 my updates is around stakeholder groups. We've
8 really intentionally tried to bring experts in the
9 field, bring parents in to guide decisions and the
10 work that we're doing. We have had another
11 stakeholder group around adapted curriculum and
12 students who are being served on the Extended
13 Content Standards really to look at how can we
14 improve services across the state and how can we
15 address what we see as significant barriers right
16 now.

17 Those groups came together and formed
18 five different workgroups that are focused on
19 community partnerships, teacher recruitment, and
20 retention, which has been a real challenge
21 in Extended Content Standards classrooms across
22 the state, and ensuring that we have an
23 adequate -- not only a pipeline to get teachers
24 into those classes, but that they're being
25 adequately prepared on their pathway there and

1 then supported through ongoing professional
2 learning, coaching, and mentorship.

3 One of the things that you frequently
4 see with teachers who are teaching in classrooms
5 with the Extended Content Standards is, there's
6 frequently not somebody else in their school or
7 schools close by that they can consult with and
8 have mentorship with. And so we're really
9 thinking about how can we better connect teachers
10 that have these really unique challenges that they
11 face in terms of their role.

12 We also have a workgroup on
13 professional development on the curriculum itself
14 and then how can we leverage the resources that we
15 do have in terms of human capital. So our next
16 meeting is coming up January 14th. Those
17 workgroups at that point in time -- what they've
18 done to this point is described the barriers that
19 they're currently facing that are related to their
20 particular topic. They have talked about
21 potential solutions to those, and they're going to
22 make some formal recommendations at the meeting on
23 January 14th that we could move forward with.

24 There are also some overarching
25 recommendations that were made by that group that

1 they will consider, the first of which -- if you
2 look at each of the recommendations of each of
3 those groups, they all talk about ensuring best
4 practice, and we got into a discussion about do we
5 have a common understanding or are we able to
6 operationalize what best practice is as we teach
7 Extended Content Standards.

8 And I don't know that we were able to
9 come to a common definition of that yet. So that
10 will also be one of the things that we're working
11 on with that group, is throughout our
12 recommendations when we say "best practice," what
13 exactly do we mean by that, what is evidence-based
14 supports, and what does that look like day-to-day
15 in the classroom. So we will be doing work around
16 that as well.

17 The next update is on conference. We
18 had conference in November in Greensboro, November
19 19th to the 22nd. It felt like it was a really
20 great success. We had 14 institutes on the
21 19th -- 13 or 14 institutes the 19th. We had 1400
22 people attend that. This gives folks an
23 opportunity to spend a full day in-depth on a
24 particular topic. We had topics that ranged from
25 low incidence things like adapted physical

1 education. We had one on autism. We had one on
2 the SLD policy. We had some around best practices
3 in reading instruction. So a varied agenda that
4 we brought experts from the State and also
5 nationally to hold those institutes.

6 And then the 20th through the 22nd,
7 we had over 2400 people at conference. We had
8 over 95 sessions. I've had a chance to review the
9 evaluation feedback from those sessions. It was
10 all very high. I'm very pleased with the quality
11 of the program that we're able to put together
12 each year.

13 As I go and attend the sessions, what
14 I -- I think what always strikes me is that the
15 program for conference is predominantly presenters
16 of practitioners in the field, and the quality of
17 the work that's being shared, it makes you happy
18 to be an educator in North Carolina to see what we
19 can aspire to based on those presentations, and
20 they're also rooted in evidence and research but
21 practical, how do you make this happen at the
22 district, at the classroom level.

23 So I really appreciated the
24 opportunity to host everybody at the conference in
25 Greensboro. We had an amazing plenary session, if

1 you attended that. We had the most parents ever
2 attend. We did extend out five free parent
3 conference registrations to eight different
4 organizations across the state, so it was good to
5 see parents in attendance. I will say, as I
6 attended the sessions, I frequently saw parents
7 being the ones staying after the sessions,
8 engaging the presenters, having good conversations
9 about the content.

10 The next thing I want to talk about
11 is the autism policy. So we have taken that to
12 the State Board. The changes to that have passed.
13 We are now in a training mode. Our autism
14 consultants are out in the field training almost
15 daily. One of our folks who's stationed here and
16 who has a cube next to me, I saw her today for the
17 first time in about a month. I was like, "Wow,
18 how have you been?" And she's been out ensuring
19 the implementation of the new policy will go
20 smoothly.

21 We've completed a guidance document
22 for the field that's really designed for use by
23 teachers that's complete. We are taking that and
24 making that into a parents guidance document as
25 well, so one that has content that's more

1 relevant, language friendly for parent use. That
2 is in the process of being developed right now.
3 The draft is almost complete. We'll have that
4 done prior to the holidays, and we'll send that
5 out to the same stakeholders who provided the
6 feedback on the autism policy before we send that
7 out. We've been partnering with the Exceptional
8 Children's Assistance Center, ECAC, for the
9 development of that guidance document.

10 The final thing that I wanted to
11 touch base on is the work that we're doing around
12 school mental health. As I talk with folks in the
13 field -- my wife is a teacher. As I talk to her
14 on a daily basis, the frequency and intensity of
15 the mental health problems that we're dealing with
16 in schools are ever-growing, and we know that we
17 have a system that's porous that some kids can
18 find cracks to fall through because it is a
19 complex system to navigate through the different
20 resources and ways that mental health are
21 administered.

22 So we've had an ongoing group for
23 about the past three years called the North
24 Carolina School Mental Health Initiative that has
25 brought together educators, has brought together

1 advocates, it's brought together policymakers,
2 higher ed folks, lawyers, attorneys to really
3 start thinking about how can we improve the system
4 and how can we better align systems, how can we
5 better align what's happening in the schools to
6 what's happening with community-based mental
7 health.

8 And we've taken the recommendations
9 of that team, and two years ago, we wrote a grant
10 to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services
11 Agency. We were fortunate to be awarded a grant
12 that's \$8.8 million over five years to begin
13 implementing some of the recommendations, and
14 that's called North Carolina Project Activate. We
15 now have a project director for Project Activate.
16 We are up and running with staff in three
17 different districts.

18 Those districts were chosen to be
19 representative of the state at large based on
20 their demography, their size. So we are up and
21 running in Cleveland County and Rockingham County
22 and Beaufort County. The work that has been done
23 there really follows a multi-tiered system of
24 support where a primary focus of the grant is how
25 do we look at core programming to support kids

1 socially, to support kids emotionally, and to
2 support kids behaviorally. We think a lot about
3 academics and that they need to be explicitly
4 taught, but don't think about some of those social
5 skills, emotional coping resiliency skills that
6 can be explicitly taught in schools.

7 So focusing on those core types of
8 supports that will build resiliency, that promote
9 good mental health, and then think about how can
10 we help groups of kids that may have similar
11 issues, how do we identify kids that are having
12 social skills issues, how do we identify kids that
13 are having externalizing or internalizing
14 behavioral issues, and then how do we match them
15 to appropriate interventions that we know have an
16 evidence base for the issues that they're
17 demonstrating.

18 So these schools are working
19 carefully in selecting what those evidence-based
20 practices are, the methodology for determining how
21 to quickly get the supports for kids that need
22 them, and then, finally, we also know that in some
23 situations, we're going to find that kids are
24 exhibiting mental health issues that exceed the
25 capacity of what we can support in the school,

1 that we need the community resources, so how do we
2 develop strong partnerships with other community
3 agencies and codify what those partnerships look
4 like through memorandums of agreement, memorandums
5 of understanding, through thinking critically and
6 creatively about how we can quickly make referrals
7 and get supports for kids when that capacity
8 exceeds what we're able to provide. So they've
9 been working with their local community health
10 resources to do that.

11 I do want to say, if you go to the
12 Rural Health Hub, they have recently done a
13 spotlight on Project Activate that details what is
14 happening in each of those three districts. The
15 intent of what is occurring in those districts is
16 that they serve right now as transformation zones
17 or models of best practice. We look really
18 carefully at what can be done, what can work at
19 the local level, and then how can we replicate and
20 scale that across the state.

21 They have been tremendous partners.
22 They present with us. They were at conference.
23 They had sessions there. They do panel
24 discussions. They're very frequently invited to
25 present and share their story, and they are very

1 welcome to establish relationships with other
2 partners across the state so that this work can be
3 replicated.

4 So those of the major things that are
5 going on right now that I wanted to provide an
6 update on that have evolved since the last meeting
7 here. I really appreciate the time to share those
8 updates. I'm happy to take any questions on any
9 of those or other things as well.

10 MS. COFFEY: Matt, one question I
11 have within the mental health, is there any plans
12 for anything at this point as far as general ed
13 teachers being more able to identify behaviors as
14 mental health problems and more help in that area?
15 Is there anything in the plans for that?

16 MR. HOSKINS: Yeah. So there's a lot
17 of different training that is being provided that
18 is targeting all folks that work within the
19 schools and have contact with students, and so I
20 think the most common training that's being used
21 in these sites, but that also is being supported
22 across the state as well, is Youth Mental Health
23 First Aid that gives all teachers an understanding
24 of some of the etiology or causes of mental health
25 issues, talks some about cases and trauma, but

1 then also gives them a baseline level of
2 understanding to be able to recognize mental
3 health issues, things to do to promote mental
4 wellness, but then also some kind of basic things,
5 what do you do if you see some of these things
6 occurring in students.

7 I think mental wellness and promotion
8 and ensuring all of our teachers are well-versed
9 in that, it's really the first part of the
10 recommendations of the North Carolina School
11 Mental Health Initiative, that we're way better
12 off preventing issues than we are trying to work
13 with kids and families that are in crisis mode.

14 MS. COFFEY: Is there a chance that
15 will ever be a mandatory training?

16 MR. HOSKINS: I don't know that we'll
17 ever -- if that specific training will ever be
18 mandatory. I do know that we're really fortunate
19 at DPI to be able to administer some grants that
20 support training through some of the school safety
21 grants. I can't -- I can't tell you whether that
22 will ever be mandatory.

23 MR. BAKER: I do have a question.
24 One of the concerns that we have when we're
25 talking about the increase of incidences of mental

1 health and what our teachers are having to deal
2 with in the classrooms is how to -- before we had
3 basic guides, and we're now so academically
4 focused -- finding time for some of those programs
5 and practices that were really instrumental before
6 we went to just a push, push for academics.

7 We know how both behavior and
8 academics sort of impact one another. So finding
9 time now to address those sorts of issues during
10 the normal school hours without it impacting the
11 times that we're given where we're supposed to
12 have instruction going on -- academic instruction.

13 MR. HOSKINS: And that is a great
14 question and one that we have really been
15 wrestling with because when you say
16 social-emotional competencies is something we need
17 to teach just like we're teaching reading and
18 math, there's only so many hours and minutes in
19 the day. How do we do that? We've recently
20 partnered with CASEL, which is a national
21 organization that looks at social-emotional
22 learning, and we've been identifying some of the
23 standards that we have here at DPI around those
24 social-emotional competencies.

25 And we're working on a project now

1 that's how can we start thinking about some
2 cross-walking between some social-emotional
3 learning skills and some of the academic standards
4 that are out there. So my background is in
5 mathematics instruction. When I think about what
6 makes a kid successful in mathematics, it's those
7 kids who are able to exhibit grit, those kids who
8 are able to demonstrate resiliency, to sit down
9 and work through a problem for a long period of
10 time, may be unsuccessful multiple times until
11 they finally kind of tackle it. And some of the
12 math research is actually starting to show that as
13 well, is that willingness to engage in a
14 productive struggle is critically important.

15 So how can we start teaching some of
16 these coping and resiliency skills through the
17 context of academics and not think about these
18 things as a dichotomy and kind of dualistically,
19 but how can we teach these things together. I
20 gave an example that's fairly an easy one to make,
21 though. So it's going to be challenging, how can
22 we really start to expand this out and then
23 provide the training and the coaching necessary to
24 do it well. I think that's where that question
25 ultimately gets answered.

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: I just wanted to
2 make one comment that we had -- during our
3 administrator training at the conference, we had a
4 huge presentation on mental health in that line,
5 and not thinking about the emotional and the
6 practical and instructional part of mental health,
7 but a few years ago, this was really brought on by
8 the EC Division and [inaudible] was at the center
9 at grouping those folks together.

10 But to be respectful, it's not
11 special ed money that needs to pay for that. It
12 is -- this is a kid issue, not who are you,
13 special ed or regular ed.

14 MR. BAKER: Absolutely.

15 MS. HUTCHINSON: This is a kid issue.
16 And I think that what we heard at conference -- or
17 at least I heard it -- was that there's a feeling
18 out there that if there's a mental health issue,
19 it's a referral issue for special education, and
20 there are general ed kids out there every single
21 day and a large number of them that are not
22 special ed, but they need those mental health
23 supports and services.

24 MR. BAKER: Absolutely.

25 MS. HUTCHINSON: And so this really

1 has to become like a push for regular ed, and
2 respectfully, in that mental health consortium of
3 folks, I don't know if there is any regular ed
4 folks that actively participated. I can't
5 remember. And it's not a slam on regular ed.
6 It's just that it has to be a collaborative
7 approach---

8 MR. BAKER: I agree.

9 MS. HUTCHINSON: ---and it can't be
10 we refer kids for special ed and an evaluation
11 because there's mental health issues. We have to
12 like change it systematically through like a
13 system of support.

14 MR. BAKER: I've been suggesting
15 doing that for a long time.

16 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's got to be like
17 an MTSS thing, like what is in support of our tier
18 one levels, our intensive supports, our -- you
19 know, and I think that EC folks are the
20 cheerleaders because their kids maybe are affected
21 at higher rates, but that doesn't mean that all
22 special ed kids have mental health needs and it
23 doesn't mean that no regular ed kids don't.

24 MR. BAKER: Correct.

25 MS. HUTCHINSON: I think the struggle

1 is that there have been grants and funding -- like
2 our state safety grant did kind of align with the
3 mental health stuff, but it's nowhere near the
4 amount that needs to happen to address the problem
5 because we have kids that, like Matt said, are
6 falling through the cracks because if they have
7 private insurance, there's nothing out there for
8 them.

9 There is nothing, and it is extremely
10 frustrating, from a person who lives in a school
11 every day, to see these kids who need day
12 treatment, and you can call 15 day treatments, and
13 they say, "Oh, it's a private. Oh, bye." That
14 kid is still struggling and they're still in my
15 school and I still need to serve them.

16 MR. BAKER: Parents are coming to us
17 and they're frustrated as well.

18 MS. HUTCHINSON: And you mentioned at
19 the beginning of your comment that what are we
20 doing to arm our teachers because this is what
21 they're dealing with, but I also would like to say
22 what are we doing to arm our parents. And I know
23 parents can access the Mental Health First
24 Aid Training, but those aren't the folks that I
25 see there, but they need it.

1 MR. BAKER: Absolutely.

2 MS. HUTCHINSON: Their children with
3 mental health needs are living with them for 18
4 hours a day, or however many, and many times if
5 you just look at genetics, those folks are also
6 struggling with mental health issues.

7 MR. BAKER: Yes.

8 MS. HUTCHINSON: So those are the
9 people that need even more training, and there's
10 not much out there for them, when I've attempted
11 to help people find those resources. So I think
12 it's like a way bigger problem for our legislative
13 folks to spend a lot of time on.

14 MR. BAKER: I agree.

15 MS. HUTCHINSON: Not that we don't
16 want to do our job; I'm not saying that. It's
17 just we need other people to help us do our job
18 too, bigger people.

19 MR. BAKER: Yeah, absolutely.

20 MR. HOSKINS: And so I don't want
21 to -- I know that we have limited time, and I
22 don't want to go too far into it. But as
23 educators, we see the silos between general and
24 special ed, but then it's even bigger than that.
25 Then it's, well, what's happening between

1 education, what's happening with fee-based mental
2 health at DHHS, what's happening with supports
3 being provided to Juvenile Justice.

4 MR. BAKER: That's right.

5 MR. HOSKINS: And so the issue---

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: And we're stuck in
7 the middle of it trying to help those kids.

8 MR. HOSKINS: ---even more, and what
9 happens -- what happens is, we're all doing our
10 own thing, and you end up with redundancies in the
11 system where we're providing Youth Mental Health
12 First Aid, DHHS is providing Youth Mental Health
13 First Aid. How are we targeting and ensuring that
14 those efforts are integrated together?

15 So I'm really excited about, through
16 that same grant and our work with SAMHSA, being
17 able to work with some technical assistance
18 centers where we've actually worked with all of
19 those state agencies to do an inventory of exactly
20 what are we doing and doing an analysis for those
21 gaps and redundancies so that we can better
22 coordinate the services across the agencies, how
23 we can better think flexibly about coordinating
24 our funding streams to ensure that our efforts are
25 pushing forward in the same way and never kind of

1 against each other. So I'm really excited about
2 that work in the coordination of mental health
3 supports as well.

4 Okay. With that, I want to move to
5 some recognitions. So we are -- I just want to
6 take a moment to express my gratitude to this
7 group who regularly meets here, but I know also
8 spends a lot of time outside of these meetings
9 thinking about these issues carefully, critically,
10 and making recommendations to us that we are very
11 confident in receiving. So we really appreciate
12 the work that this group does, the role that you
13 serve, and how you support kids across the state
14 with disabilities.

15 So at this time, I would like to --
16 today we're actually nominating chairs and vice
17 chairs. So I would like to recognize the current
18 Chair and Vice Chair. So, first, I would like to
19 recognize Cynthia.

20 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Thank you.

21 MR. HOSKINS: So Cynthia Daniels-
22 Hall. And this says, "This is presented to
23 Cynthia Daniels-Hall for dedicated service to the
24 Council on Educational Services for Exceptional
25 Children, December 2019." Thank you so much for

1 your service.

2 Next, I would like to recognize
3 Leanna George for your service as well. And I do
4 want to give you both a moment. If you have any
5 words that you would like to share, I would like
6 to give you an opportunity to do so. If you
7 don't, then that's okay as well.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: I figured I would
9 say a few words at the end, but I guess I won't be
10 in charge at the end so I can't do that, can I?

11 It's been a pleasure this last --
12 I've forgotten how long it's been since I became
13 chair, and we kind of overlooked the policy where
14 it said you only serve for a year. So remember
15 that. So if you get nominated and voted in as
16 chair, remember, it's only for one year.

17 MS. DANIELS-HALL: No, it's two
18 years.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: No, it was one
20 year.

21 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Two.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'll have to
23 double-check then. But, anyway---

24 MR. HOSKINS: Yeah, we can check the
25 bylaws over the next break.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, we'll have to
2 look over the bylaws again. Anyway, but it's been
3 a pleasure. Thank you for all your support. I
4 couldn't do this alone. I couldn't do this
5 without Cynthia or Vicki, when -- you know, she
6 stepped off for her tenure -- and support from the
7 Council and all the opportunities that have been
8 given to us.

9 Thank you, and let's continue the
10 fight. We're here to try to make our system a
11 better system. It's not about my child or your
12 child; it's about all of our kids, it's about all
13 of our teachers, it's about all of our schools so
14 that they can become who they're supposed to be
15 from here into the future. As long as we keep
16 that as the focus, despite little disagreements
17 here and there about methodologies, we'll go a
18 long way. So thank you, everybody.

19 MS. DANIELS-HALL: So I just want to
20 say thank you, everyone, for being able to
21 participate collaboratively with you-all and that
22 everything that Leanna said is right, that it is
23 about all the children here in North Carolina who
24 live with disabilities and all of those families
25 who were really hard for their own children.

1 Thank you all.

2 MR. HOSKINS: Thank you all so much
3 for your work. And this makes me just want to
4 share a very quick story about the importance of a
5 group like this that bring different perspectives
6 to decision-making.

7 So I lived in Ashe County for a
8 little bit, and when my son was six or seven years
9 old, we went up to the top of Mount Jefferson,
10 which is right there on the side of the city, if
11 you have ever been there. And we looked out over
12 one of the overlooks, and I said to him -- I said
13 look how much we can see from up there. Like,
14 "Look that is our house. See that little tiny
15 thing down there. That's where we live. That's
16 our house. We can see so much more from up here
17 at this perspective."

18 He said, "We can't see more here,
19 Dad."

20 And I said, "What are you talking
21 about?"

22 He was like, "I can't see the blades
23 of grass. I can't see the leaves on the trees. I
24 can't see the windows on the house." And it was
25 just like, oh, wow, it's not that we can see more;

1 it's just we see it from a different perspective.
2 We see different things. And being able to have
3 those different perspectives and see those
4 different perspectives is so critical to
5 decision-making, and you can't do it from a single
6 perspectives.

7 So thank you so much for bringing
8 your perspectives, your experiences to the work of
9 the State Board and to the Department of Public
10 Instruction. Thanks.

11 MS. UTZ: All right. So the next
12 thing on the agenda is to make the nominations for
13 the new chair and vice chair. So it is going to
14 be done through a Mentimeter. So let me pull that
15 up really quick, and I'm just going to leave this
16 up over lunch so that by the time -- by like
17 12:30, if you could have all your voting done so
18 that I can then put it in too so that when we come
19 back from lunch, we can actually do the voting.

20 Whoops. I've got to show the people
21 on the phone. So if you will go to menti.com on a
22 phone, computer, whatever it is, you'll use the
23 code that's up there and then just type in your
24 nomination for who you think should be the chair
25 or vice chair. This one is just going to be

1 chair, and then I'll take it to vice chair.

2 I guess we'll have to do that before
3 we go to lunch since -- I was thinking it was one
4 screen, but it's not. It's two different screens.
5 So we'll just take a few minutes to do this, and
6 then I'll go to vice chair.

7 (Pause.)

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if I
9 can run again, so---

10 MS. UTZ: No, you cannot.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Not for chair.

12 Sorry.

13 MS. UTZ: Not for chair. They could
14 nominate you for vice chair, not for chair.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: Oh, well.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: This isn't a vote.
17 This is just the nominations, so---

18 MS. UTZ: Yeah, we'll get to the
19 voting after lunch.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll probably make
21 lunch a working lunch because I know we still have
22 to get our presentation from Ms. King in as well,
23 so -- it's hard to follow up Nancy and be on time.

24 MS. UTZ: I'll give it another
25 minute, and then I think we'll have everyone from

1 here and on the phone.

2 (Pause.)

3 MS. UTZ: Okay. And then if you'll
4 do the same thing for vice chair.

5 (Pause.)

6 MS. UTZ: All right. We had 12 last
7 time and 12 this time. So before -- the last
8 thing, is there anyone that was nominated for vice
9 chair that would like to withdraw their nomination
10 and don't want to be part of the voting that their
11 name is up there?

12 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Okay. My name is
13 up there for vice chair, and I've already been
14 vice chair so I can't be vice chair again.

15 MS. UTZ: Okay. All right. And then
16 let me go back to chair. Is there anyone that is
17 nominated that would not like to be considered?

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: The same situation.

19 MS. UTZ: Right. Sorry. All right.
20 Then, during lunchtime, I'll get the voting set
21 up, and then when we come back from lunch, we'll
22 do a quick vote and see who our new chair and vice
23 chair are.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: As I said, let's do
25 a working lunch. So let's go ahead and get our

1 plates now and we'll be back in about ten or 15
2 minutes and get our presentation. That,
3 hopefully, will put us back on time. Sorry for --
4 you're Ms. King, right? Yes. Sorry for the delay
5 here.

6 (Pause.)

7 MS. UTZ: All right. So as you guys
8 are eating, I will put up the voting so that you
9 guys can go ahead and vote for chair, and then
10 we'll go ahead and vote for vice chair as we're
11 eating. So the names are up there.

12 (A luncheon recess was taken from
13 12:19 p.m. to 12:50 p.m.)

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: So you yield the
15 election to -- is that what we were saying?

16 MR. HOSKINS: I was just going to say
17 the same thing. Sorry.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: You yield the
19 nomination to---

20 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes, I would like
21 to.

22 MS. UTZ: So, then, I will go and
23 move the screen to vice chair, and we will do the
24 same thing.

25 MR. BAKER: So could I say one thing

1 before we do that?

2 MS. UTZ: Yes.

3 MR. BAKER: So would you have the
4 same objections for vice chair?

5 MS. HUTCHINSON: I see that one a
6 little differently. I don't want to impact this
7 at all, but I see that a little differently
8 because I feel like the chair is the point of
9 contact, and I have a little different perspective
10 on that, and maybe it's not right, but I'm more
11 open---

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: It would be fine
13 until one of us parents had an issue, and then it
14 would turn into "You don't know what my life is."
15 It would be perfectly fine until something
16 happened.

17 **(Pause.)**

18 MS. UTZ: All right. I think we have
19 everyone's vote. So it looks like Christy
20 Hutchinson has most the votes with ten, Christy
21 Grant with one, and Diane Coffey with one.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: So do you want to
23 take over the meeting now, Madam Chair?

24 MS. DANIELS-HALL: I'll let you
25 finish out the day.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. It is
2 1:00 and we have it kind of concreted in for
3 public comments from 1:00 to 1:30. I see we have
4 a large population out in the field, and I forgot
5 to grab the sign-in sheet. So let me grab that
6 real quick.

7 All right. I'll call you one at a
8 time to come up. Remember, we have a three-minute
9 limit per person. We don't weight that too
10 terribly heavily, so -- and just remember any
11 concerns around privacy and that the Council is
12 not a dispute resolution entity. So you can come
13 tell us you hate your kid's teacher, but there's
14 probably not much we can do about that. So---

15 First up, we have the [name
16 redacted].

17 PUBLIC SPEAKER 1: My son was
18 privately diagnosed with dyslexia after his school
19 district refused to evaluate him when I asked them
20 to. They rather naively expected my son to be
21 taught to read and write proficiently whilst at
22 public school. However, all my requests for help
23 were ignored.

24 Like many dyslexics, my son did a
25 pretty good job of memorizing sight words and

1 pretending to read. Like 56 percent of third
2 graders in Wake County, my son passed his third
3 grade EOGs and was apparently on track for career
4 and college readiness. Yet, he could not decode a
5 word and he didn't recognize or write more than
6 one sentence.

7 Later testing showed that my son's
8 skills were far below grade level, and he had not
9 mastered skills that were critical for continued
10 growth in word-level reading. The fact that my
11 son had passed the state test was all that
12 mattered to Guilford County. He was not
13 proficient in reading or writing, and no matter
14 how many times I tried to tell the professionals,
15 I was simply a parent and an annoyance. A passing
16 EOG score is not the whole story in the education
17 of a child when countless other data points are
18 ignored.

19 I want you to know that my son was
20 able to pass an EOG whilst having significant
21 difficulty with decoding and encoding which
22 impacted his reading and writing abilities. He
23 demonstrated a 20 percent proficiency with
24 spelling grade-level words. His decoding skills
25 were measured directly and found to be the first

1 percentile. His phonemic decoding proficiency
2 score was in the eighteenth percentile, and his
3 working memory was in the eighth percentile.

4 My son had been able to learn to read
5 a sufficient number of sight words and was able to
6 meet some measure of grade performance. His
7 knowledge of letter-sound association and spelling
8 patterns were far below grade level, and his
9 overall score on sound-symbol knowledge was at the
10 first percentile in comparison to students his
11 age. This was in contrast to his ability to read
12 real familiar words. My son had developed some
13 basic phonological awareness skills, however had
14 not mastered the higher level of skills that are
15 critical for continued growth in word-level
16 reading.

17 How does this happen? How is a child
18 able to move through grades with such huge
19 deficits in their learning without anyone being
20 aware? How can a child be declared to be on track
21 for college and a career without being unable to
22 read or write proficiently? Parents deserve to be
23 heard and our children deserve to receive an
24 appropriate and free education.

25 Undiagnosed disabilities do result in

1 behavioral issues, they do result in self-esteem
2 issues, and they do result in extreme anxiety. At
3 eight years old, my son was so anxious that he
4 told us he wanted to die. Undiagnosed needs are
5 serious, and we need to do better.

6 My child hung in there for two years.
7 An eight-year-old shouldn't need grit and
8 resilience, and he isn't a math problem. Our
9 students shouldn't have to survive an education.
10 He's a person with a name and he deserves an
11 education. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, [name
13 redacted]. Next is [name redacted].

14 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: As I said, I'll
15 try to read fast. My name is [name redacted], and
16 I'm an educator with over two decades of classroom
17 experience from primary to college level. I
18 recently retired from the Pennsylvania teaching
19 system. I was an educational leader. I am a
20 researcher. I'm an adjunct professor at a
21 graduate college teaching teachers getting their
22 principal certificates and reading specialist
23 degrees.

24 I worked as a consultant and provided
25 professional development to many districts. I

1 hold many degrees and certifications including a
2 master's in curriculum and instruction and a
3 doctorate in educational leadership, along with
4 other -- other criteria along the way.

5 Now one would assume that with my
6 educational background and my devotion to research
7 that I would have obtained the experience about
8 the science of literacy, educational law, and how
9 to read and interpret data to make educational
10 decisions for my students, but this was not the
11 case. And let me tell you Pennsylvania's
12 standards for teaching are higher than North
13 Carolina's standards. Teachers have to have a
14 master's degree and you have to -- you know, so
15 for me not to have this information is pretty
16 glaring.

17 I did not know and I was ignorant of
18 my ignorance. In all my collegiate studies, my
19 district professional development, I was never
20 provided essential knowledge on the science of
21 reading, information on dyslexia, the skills
22 required to identify a dyslexic student, or
23 trained to use the tools utilized by districts to
24 obtain present reading levels.

25 Since I lacked this knowledge, it is

1 not difficult to believe or realize that teachers,
2 educational leaders, reading specialists, and
3 school psychologists as well do not have this
4 knowledge either.

5 In 2016, I made the heart-wrenching
6 discovery that my son had fallen through the
7 proverbial cracks and failed to be identified as
8 dyslexic because, of course, it's his autism, it's
9 his lack of focus. While his cognitive abilities
10 were above his peers, he struggled to read and
11 write. A mother's guilt does a lot, and with
12 that, along my professional obligation to find
13 truth, I set out on a two-year journey to figure
14 out how much child and how other children fall
15 through the cracks.

16 Teachers are often blamed, but they
17 are not the problem. Teachers beg for solutions,
18 real solutions to help their students. It is
19 tiresome to jump on and off of bandwagons.
20 Teachers have great intentions, yet lack the
21 knowledge they need of how the brain learns to
22 read. The 45 years of scientific research---

23 And I heard research cited earlier.
24 There is research-based, there's research
25 evidence-based, and there's scientific research.

1 Our laws hold us to the scientific research, which
2 is the same level as the FDA uses for drug
3 approval with randomized controlled trials, and so
4 you need to make sure all research is not the
5 same. So keep that tucked away, please.

6 ---to learn the 45 years of
7 scientific research to know how to teach reading,
8 understand dyslexia, and the knowledge and skills
9 to read data and to make diagnostic decisions.
10 Many psychologists that were actually brought on
11 board by our federal government underneath Jimmy
12 Carter to actually advocate and protect parents do
13 not even understand dyslexia or know how to
14 identify it. There is not a test for dyslexia. I
15 can look at any ed psych and tell you if a child
16 is dyslexic or not. You have to be able to read
17 the data.

18 Over two years of research, attending
19 conferences rooted in science, obtaining my
20 credentials as a literacy teacher in the science
21 of reading, becoming certified as a dyslexia
22 practitioner, personal conversations with experts
23 in the field, and actually living in Trinidad for
24 two months studying underneath the great Dr. Tim
25 Conway, who actually teaches people to read who

1 have had strokes.

2 If you can rewire a brain of a
3 65-year-old with a stroke and learn to read again,
4 you can rewire any brain. And I was under the
5 erroneous belief that after third grade, a child's
6 brain is more difficult to rewire, but no.
7 There's a lot of myths out there, and I am still
8 being schooled. I am definitely not an expert,
9 but I have a lot of experience in this area.

10 I've also -- I've also learned a lot
11 from Dr. Pete Wright from Wrightslaw, as I
12 personally have interactions with him, and I've
13 learned how to acquire knowledge and skills to be
14 able to teach any child to read. Knowledge is
15 power, and currently, educators within this state
16 lack the knowledge, lack the skills in order for
17 all children to learn to read, and all children
18 can learn to read.

19 My findings revealed significant
20 problems with professional development related to
21 the teaching of reading, and this impacts not only
22 dyslexics but any child with a language-based
23 disability, whether it's apraxia or otherwise. We
24 need -- especially in the areas of the knowledge
25 and skills of the science of reading and dyslexia,

1 we need to understand all of those things in order
2 to implement and to be able to ask for RTI
3 effectively.

4 Child Find is being ignored. Most
5 teachers don't even understand what Child Find is,
6 and that goes from birth to the age of 21. If a
7 child is struggling to read, they will struggle to
8 learn all the way through their academic career.
9 The State really needs to start to look at the
10 law. In IDEA 2004, there is actually a mandate
11 that says that schools must teach reading using
12 science to the maximum extent possible. Most
13 schools don't even understand what the science of
14 reading is.

15 The science of reading was developed
16 out of the 1999 National Reading Panel that
17 testified before Congress, and they had five
18 pillars that they said needed to be done in order
19 to read. That's the ingredients. They never
20 actually went far enough to put it into action,
21 and so the Center for Effective Reading
22 Instruction actually created standards for
23 teaching reading, teaching literacy.

24 We need to adopt those standards here
25 in North Carolina. There are skills and knowledge

1 for the science of reading that comes out of the
2 1999 National Reading Panel, and most people don't
3 even know they exist. The cause of our reading
4 crisis is not due to a lack of funding. We don't
5 need more money. In fact, we would save money if
6 we would do things the right way. It is due to a
7 lack of knowledge.

8 Therefore, it is impossible for
9 districts to provide effective interventions. It
10 is impossible to provide an appropriate education
11 which the law mandates called FAPE, which we've
12 all heard of. It is impossible to ensure that
13 teachers of reading are able to identify students
14 with reading disabilities. We have got to provide
15 our teachers with the knowledge and the tools in
16 order to do this.

17 I used to think it was crazy when
18 they said every child could read by the end of
19 third grade. I was just in a classroom a year
20 ago. It is not impossible. I was wrong. The
21 science of reading has been around for decades.
22 The algorithm was so compelling that the United
23 States Congress, a bipartisan Congress, actually
24 approved it and put it in IDEA, and if you want to
25 or you're bored, you can read the commentary on

1 that.

2 All children can learn to read.
3 Prolific studies on the science of reading helps
4 not only children with dyslexia, which is about 20
5 percent of the population, most are unidentified,
6 but it also helps others with language-based,
7 specific learning disabilities, students who
8 struggle due to a lack of a text rich environment,
9 and also students who are English language
10 learners. It even helps gifted students.

11 Dyslexia is an organic medical
12 condition with an educational remedy. Schools
13 still are not using the science of reading.
14 Instead they rely on antiquated theories that have
15 been proven ineffective. In fact, most districts
16 now try to use a blended approach or balanced
17 literacy, which is actually whole language
18 renamed. Both of these haphazard models have no
19 scientific backing and are actually harmful to our
20 children.

21 Can you imagine if the medical
22 profession was permitted to treat patients using a
23 theory instead of science? That is exactly what
24 we are doing with our children. Outside the realm
25 of using science, schools see no academic

1 improvement. This is evident because there is no
2 improvement in literacy over the past 50 years.
3 Conversely, the medical field has made vast gains
4 because they are mandated to use science,
5 evidence-based science in order for insurance
6 companies to reimburse them for their services.
7 Education needs to be held to the same standards.

8 North Carolina continues to collect
9 federal funds, yet fails to follow the mandates
10 that are on the books at the federal level. It is
11 okay if educators do not know these things. It is
12 okay if educational leaders do not know these
13 things because I didn't. It is not okay for us to
14 choose to stay ignorant because I consider myself
15 an educator still. We have got to have a
16 teachable spirit.

17 More money is not the answer.
18 Billions of dollars are wasted every single year
19 because schools are digging in their heels to
20 defend antiquated practices instead of digging
21 into the 45 years of scientific studies. Poverty
22 is not the cause of the reading crisis. Schools
23 not using science is the cause of the reading
24 crisis. There are struggling readers from
25 impoverished homes -- more struggling readers from

1 impoverished homes because welfare families can't
2 afford to have the funds to pay for private
3 tutors. So there is discrimination and an equity
4 issue.

5 Freedom is won and lost in our
6 classrooms. Reading is a civil right. Reading is
7 the basis for our freedom. Noah Webster knew this
8 when he began and he penned the first dictionary
9 after the Revolutionary War. Frederick Douglass
10 knew this as he fought for this very freedom.
11 Literacy has a long history, and it is used for
12 social control and oppression when we deny it from
13 our children and from our citizens.

14 Throughout much of history, the
15 ability to read was something that only the
16 privileged and upper white men were allowed.
17 Schools were not free. Education was provided to
18 that select few of privileged class, and the poor
19 and the powerless were kept down. No one would
20 argue with this fact, but literacy is about
21 freedom.

22 And our children who are -- who have
23 disabilities, dyslexia is a comorbidity that is
24 missed often. Dyslexia is misunderstood. It just
25 means difficulty with words, whether it's spoken

1 words, written words, comprehension, processing.
2 If schools used the scientific approach and
3 appropriate intensive professional development and
4 implemented RTI or MTSS the way it was designed,
5 all children would be reading on grade level by
6 the end of third grade. Failure to do so is
7 keeping our children in special education and
8 keeping poverty alive.

9 Schools do not use science to guide
10 educational practices because of the glaring void
11 in teacher preparation programs as well. We need
12 to start providing teachers with the tools that
13 they need to be able to teach our children to
14 read. They need to be competent, analytical
15 readers. This not only, if they do not become
16 this, does not only impact them in school but has
17 a damaging nature for the rest of their lives.

18 Struggling readers in our society are
19 not productive members of society. Most people
20 are unaware of the negative impacts that these
21 individuals have on our society, and I am dyslexic
22 as well, recovering, on the path. Everybody pays
23 for it, financially or otherwise. It impacts
24 families, it impacts communities, it impacts our
25 country, and it impacts special needs children.

1 Statistics from our Nation's Report
2 Card and other nonbiased groups report that the
3 vast number of school failures are related to
4 reading issues. Keep in mind, 45 years of
5 scientific research indicates that these
6 individuals who have language-based learning
7 disabilities could become competent readers. They
8 feel like failures, but they need to know that
9 they are not failures. They are in a failed
10 system.

11 This is not an isolated problem.
12 More than 60 percent of fourth-graders in our
13 country are functionally illiterate, which means
14 that they lack the ability to use language to
15 function in society. Dyslexia is the most common
16 cause of dysfunctional illiteracy, and let me
17 close with some of these sobering facts to let
18 them sink in.

19 Mental health issues, which was
20 talked about here today -- mental health issues,
21 students who have learning disabilities are three
22 times likely to have mental health issues than
23 those that do not. 89 percent of suicide notes
24 that were found after a successful suicide were
25 found to have errors in it related to an issue

1 with a learning disability, namely dyslexia.

2 Struggling readers are more likely to
3 drop out of high school and end up in the criminal
4 justice system and live a life of poverty. 75
5 percent of our prison inmates are dyslexic. 85
6 percent of our juvenile delinquents are dyslexic.
7 Poor reading skills also increases the chance of a
8 young girl to become a teenage mom.

9 One study says that 21 percent of
10 girls who are well below grade average in their
11 early teens -- 21 percent of girls end up as
12 teenage moms as opposed to five percent of girls
13 who are reading on grade level. There's a loss of
14 productivity. It is estimated that we are losing
15 \$225 billion a year because of dyslexia and the
16 schools not providing appropriate education for
17 these students.

18 90 percent of welfare recipients are
19 dyslexic. Being able to read is important to
20 maintain good health. Our healthcare system is
21 spending \$100 billion because 45 percent of adults
22 cannot read their prescriptions. And trauma -- we
23 talk about posttraumatic stress and all the trauma
24 in schools, the single most powerful predictor of
25 a child that has the grit to overcome trauma is

1 the ability to read.

2 Senator Casey from Texas had a bill,
3 and it passed, where incarcerated adults are being
4 tested for dyslexia and being taught to read.
5 Incarcerated adults are getting help in our
6 country, yet students in our country and in North
7 Carolina do not. Our schools lack practices to
8 prevent children from winding up behind bars,
9 committing suicide, and developing mental health
10 issues and trauma and facing a lifetime of
11 struggles.

12 And let me just say that not only can
13 dyslexia and learning disabilities be remediated
14 at any age, they can actually be prevented.
15 Looking at 100 percent of our children not
16 struggling if we used the neurodevelopmental
17 approach to literacy.

18 So I ask that we start looking at
19 that science instead of other science. Thank you.
20 I know I went over. I appreciate it.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Anthony, did you
22 have something?

23 MR. BAKER: I guess I just want to be
24 heard today. I signed in on the wrong list.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's all right.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: [Name redacted]?

2 PUBLIC SPEAKER 3: All right. Again,
3 I'm going to tell you guys it's my first meeting
4 today. I wasn't really planning on coming today,
5 but I am [name redacted]. I have two kids that
6 are in the Wake County Public School system. I
7 have a third-grader and a fourth-grader. The
8 fourth-grader, he was identified with an IEP when
9 he was in first grade, properly identified by the
10 teacher, properly identified by the parent. We
11 have been utilizing the IEP.

12 However, I have a fourth-grader that
13 still cannot read and still cannot write. So what
14 am I doing wrong as a parent, or what are we doing
15 wrong in the education system here? She just
16 mentioned something about structured literacy, and
17 I am just starting to understand that curriculum
18 can potentially play a factor. So that's one of
19 the things I'm here to talk about today, just to
20 give you that plain overview as a parent concern.

21 I don't have a bunch of statistics
22 for you today, but again, I have a kid that can't
23 read and can't write. Do I have a kid that can't
24 be successful? I don't know, guys. I have a kid
25 who is currently playing travel ice hockey. He

1 can follow two to three step systems. He's doing
2 drills that the NHL players do. So, obviously,
3 this kid can listen and this kid can do something
4 in that realm. Why can't he succeed in reading
5 and writing?

6 That's the question I have for you
7 guys and for whoever else I'm supposed to ask
8 because as a parent I'm doing everything I can. I
9 also recently became a substitute teacher, so I
10 better need to understand what am I supposed to do
11 in that role. Granted, you know, most of the
12 time, you're just following along with this, but I
13 could go that extra step.

14 But, again, you know, what is that
15 curriculum that's positively going to affect
16 students? Because the curriculum used right now
17 isn't getting him anywhere. You tell me he's
18 improving step-by-step through all these IEP
19 meetings. Again, I have a kid that comes home, he
20 cannot read and he cannot write.

21 Mental health, I'm glad you mentioned
22 that because guess what? That's something we need
23 to look at today. You guys were very interested
24 in talking about it. One of the things you guys
25 said, how do we identify students quickly. Well,

1 we need more mandatory teacher training. If you
2 guys train the teachers on what to do instead of
3 kind of shoving it under the rug because you don't
4 know what to do with it, I think that would be
5 helpful.

6 Unfortunately, my son ran into a
7 little bit of that yesterday. I'm not going to go
8 into those details, but again, you know, that hit
9 something as a parent who wasn't really concerned
10 about the mental side of things. If my son was
11 taught more social and emotional learning skills
12 through something, I think he would be able to
13 identify and know what to do when that happens.

14 He did the right thing. He told the
15 teacher. I don't know that the teacher
16 necessarily did the right thing, but I don't know
17 that she has the right direction as to what she
18 should do. And then, in turn, I think he made
19 that cognitive decision that "Hey, I don't think I
20 got the right response from my teacher," and
21 brought it home to the parents.

22 So, again, teaching them what they
23 need to do as kids. They don't know how to
24 respond. You know, you can't respond physically.
25 Again, I have that tough hockey player. He could

1 respond in a different method, but as a parent,
2 I'm trying to teach him how to respond. So thank
3 you for starting to mention that.

4 Thank you for mentioning dyslexia as
5 well. I didn't really say what my kid was on an
6 IEP for. He's SLD. SLD, to me, I don't know
7 exactly what that means, but if I keep reading
8 everything from all these parents that are sharing
9 stories, I understand that it looks like he could
10 be dyslexic, he could have discalculia, he could
11 have dysgraphia, he could have all of them. And
12 he also definitely has social and emotional skills
13 that he needs to develop because I can see that he
14 has a hard time responding to different students.

15 You guys also mentioned, you know, we
16 do need to do something to help mental health,
17 and you weren't sure that there was enough time
18 during the school day. Well, our school is
19 currently completing a positivity project at
20 school. I don't really understand exactly what
21 that is. You know, is that funded through a
22 grant? Is that something our specific elementary
23 school is completing? There's time for that. You
24 know, we could lump that together with that
25 positivity project.

1 And when my son faced something at
2 school yesterday, the answer to me as a parent,
3 when I presented it to the teacher and the
4 principal, is that we are teaching our kids
5 kindness and the words to use through this
6 positivity project. So, hopefully, that helps,
7 you know, everybody that's kind of concerned about
8 those issues, that somehow there's been that time
9 to set aside. I just don't know why or how, and
10 that's something that could kind of connect in
11 with positivity.

12 The other thing too that I want to
13 say is that as a parent just starting into this,
14 you know, I let him sit on his IEP since first
15 grade. He's a fourth-grader and can't read and
16 write. I really didn't get involved. Here's my
17 first time being involved. I don't think I should
18 have to get to Indicator Number 15. I think
19 through -- and if anybody wants to reference
20 Indicator 15, it's, you know, within whatever
21 documents you guys have.

22 I think through all your meetings
23 that you guys do, you guys will get there. I just
24 hope you guys get there by the time my son gets to
25 be at the end of elementary school, gets to be

1 middle school, high school, and I don't know if
2 that will happen.

3 Again, I wasn't prepared to say
4 anything, but I hope this helps, and I would love
5 to ask questions in the future. Again, [name
6 redacted]. I appreciate it.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, [name
8 redacted]. It's always nerve-racking taking that
9 first step as an advocate and a mom and be able to
10 speak to everybody. Thank you for your bravery
11 because I know how challenging that can be, being
12 there myself.

13 [Name redacted]? Sorry if I tortured
14 your name.

15 PUBLIC SPEAKER 4: That's all right.
16 My name is [name redacted]. I just want to give a
17 short introduction to myself. I'm dyslexic so
18 when I went to kindergarten in 1970, I couldn't
19 put sounds to letters. And then when my daughter
20 went to kindergarten in 2005, I thought, "Oh, it's
21 been so many years. They must know how to teach a
22 dyslexic by now."

23 Sorry. I'm not going to cry. When
24 she was in sixth grade, she could not read. She's
25 a very smart girl, but she could not read. The

1 teachers at her school were kind and caring. They
2 did not know how to remediate her. I would go to
3 IEP meetings, and I would be explaining to them
4 the six syllable types, I'd be explaining to them
5 what an r-controlled vowel was, I'd be explaining
6 to them what's the difference between phonemic
7 awareness and phonological awareness. They didn't
8 know.

9 There's a huge knowledge gap --
10 there's a giant knowledge gap. She was talking
11 earlier about the science of reading. The state
12 of North Carolina needs to embrace the science of
13 reading. We need to move away from whole language
14 and move to the science of reading. So my
15 daughter was lucky. She got to go to boarding
16 school in Connecticut, and she worked with an
17 Orton-Gillingham tutor every day for 15 minutes
18 less of special education time.

19 When she started school in the
20 seventh grade, she was at the one percentile in
21 reading. She was at the beginning of seventh
22 grade. She could not read. She was still working
23 on doing hamburger (indicating). She couldn't
24 pull apart the word of hamburger into three
25 syllables. After working with the Orton-

1 Gillingham tutor every day, she went from one
2 percentile to 87 percentile in one school year.
3 By the next school year, she was at 99 percentile.
4 She was one of the best readers in the school. My
5 daughter then went on to be -- go to another very
6 good high school, and she applied and was accepted
7 to UNC Chapel Hill, but instead she turned down
8 UNC Chapel Hill, and she's going to one of the top
9 private schools in the country.

10 Now let's go back to when she was in
11 sixth grade. Nobody believed that she could read.
12 Nobody. When she was in the sixth grade, the
13 school told me, "If she hasn't learned to read by
14 now, she's not going to learn how to read," and
15 they wanted to push her out of special education
16 and exit her and give her a 504.

17 This is a major problem across the
18 state. Children don't get the help that they
19 need, and then in the sixth grade, the push out
20 happens. Because guess what they don't have in
21 middle school? Reading teachers. And it's,
22 quote, "not part of the curriculum," and they,
23 quote, "don't have to teach reading."

24 Okay. So that's how I got into this
25 work, and my daughter is okay, but many other

1 children across the state, they're not okay.
2 Boarding school in Connecticut is not the solution
3 for the reading crisis in the state of North
4 Carolina. So I'm want to talk about two more
5 topics.

6 One topic is the role of this
7 advisory council and the new special education
8 policy that's rolling out July 1st, 2020. There's
9 a lot of issues with this policy, and I know this
10 is a one-way conversation, but I would like to
11 know the role the advisory council has in
12 reviewing this SLD policy because when this policy
13 was first passed in early 2016, the advisory
14 council was very involved in reviewing this
15 policy, and the advisory council advised the State
16 Board of Education not to pass the policy, to hold
17 off.

18 The State Board of Education did not
19 take the advice of this Council and passed the
20 policy anyway. Now we're looking at the policy
21 again -- DPI is looking at the policy again, and
22 they're going to get back to the State Board with
23 changes. And I would like to know why we're not
24 having a 30-day public comment period, and I would
25 like to know if this advisory council is going to

1 look into the changes of the SLD policy and what
2 this advisory council's role is going to be with
3 respect to giving advice to the State Board of
4 Education.

5 Just, in general, this is just the
6 first page of the policy. The first page of the
7 policy defines what a specific learning disability
8 is. This is defined in IDEA. North Carolina
9 changed the definition of SLD. They changed the
10 word from a disability -- from a disorder, and
11 IDEA says it's a disorder. North Carolina changed
12 the word to disability. That is not allowed. In
13 the Federal Registry, it says it's not allowed.
14 You cannot align the definition of SLD with the
15 definition of disability. Yet, the State Board of
16 Education passed it anyway.

17 DPI took out the word psychological,
18 and SLD is a disorder in one or more of the basic
19 psychological processes. I don't know how the
20 state of North Carolina can take a federal law and
21 change a definition. The other thing is, the
22 first part when it comes to determining whether a
23 child has -- is eligible for special education,
24 the first step is to determine whether the child
25 has academic underachievement.

1 The IDEA law says you compare a
2 child's academic achievement level to state
3 standards that are expressed as benchmarks. You
4 don't compare them to state norms, district norms,
5 classroom peers. You compare them to state
6 standards. Then afterwards if the child doesn't
7 have -- has academic underachievement, then you
8 ask why, those other steps to the policy, and you
9 can say later on is it because of culture, is it
10 because of economic reasons.

11 Well, what North Carolina has done
12 is, when they're answering the question does this
13 child have academic underachievement, they're
14 comparing children to their cultural peer group.
15 What do you think cultural peer group means?
16 They're taking black kids and comparing them to
17 other black kids, white kids and comparing them to
18 other white kids. So every single cultural group
19 are going to have their own different academic
20 standard.

21 Now we've talked about this at the
22 stakeholders meeting, and we did find a consensus
23 among the stakeholders to delete that whole
24 paragraph, and I hope that DPI will delete that
25 whole paragraph because dyslexia has nothing to do

1 with race. Poverty has nothing to do with
2 dyslexia. Dyslexia is a neurological condition.
3 So that has to be removed.

4 The other thing in the policy was
5 they removed nationally normed and criterion-
6 referenced assessments. Those words don't exist
7 in the new policy anymore. So they're not using
8 nationally normed and criterion-referenced
9 assessments. Well, what are they using for
10 assessments? North Carolina, in the policy, it
11 says you can use formal and/or informal
12 assessments.

13 So you're going to determine whether
14 a child is eligible for special education with
15 informal assessments? Does anybody believe you
16 can just informally find dyslexic children? We
17 need formal assessments. Sorry. This is
18 upsetting to me.

19 Okay. The next thing I want to talk
20 about is MTSS. I strongly encourage every single
21 person who is interested in the topic of MTSS to
22 read what happened to Texas and read OSEP's letter
23 to Texas. Texas got into a lot of trouble because
24 it had a cap on how many children could be
25 identified for special education. A lot of people

1 know about that, but keep reading deeper. Texas
2 got into a lot more trouble than just the cap.

3 And one reason Texas got in trouble
4 is because teachers could not consistently tell
5 OSEP how a child moves from tier to tier. OSEP
6 went down to Texas, and they interviewed different
7 teachers, administrators. They had public comment
8 periods with parents. And when they interviewed
9 the teachers, they asked the teachers how does a
10 child move from Tier 1 to Tier 2, and the teacher
11 said, "Well, I make up a goal and I just decide
12 it."

13 And then they went to another teacher
14 in a different county, and they said, "How does a
15 teacher move -- how does a child move from Tier 1
16 to Tier 2?" And that teacher had another method.
17 North Carolina has not defined or given any
18 standards to how a child moves from tier to tier.
19 And the other thing, which I haven't seen
20 documented, but I believe it to be true, is that
21 race is also being used when a child's being moved
22 from tier to tier.

23 So it's like MTSS is supposed to look
24 at the bottom 20 percent, but because of OSEP's --
25 the way they do their oversight, states get in

1 trouble if they have overrepresentation of a
2 subgroup. So it looks to me that race is a factor
3 when moving a child from Tier 1 to Tier 2. That's
4 wrong. That's wrong. If MTSS is supposed to help
5 the kids that need the help most, then that's who
6 they help. Race should not have any part of this.

7 And so I would encourage everybody to
8 ask how does a child move from Tier 1 to Tier 2
9 and are you using race as a factor. Because
10 another parent here, they asked an MTSS trainer,
11 and they said, "Yes, race is used as a factor."
12 So that's wrong.

13 The other thing I would like to talk
14 about just briefly is early identification. There
15 is no good reason that my daughter had to go to
16 private boarding school in Connecticut at a giant
17 expense to myself as a single parent. Even though
18 she got very good financial aid, it was extremely
19 expensive.

20 Early identification is key. When
21 they saw that she couldn't pull apart words like
22 hamburger at five years old, they should have been
23 right in there giving her intensive services and
24 remediation, but the knowledge isn't there.
25 Teachers don't know how to remediate dyslexic

1 children, and honestly, if you know the science of
2 reading, that works for all kids.

3 In the 2015-2016 school year, only
4 399 [inaudible] were identified as SLD, but wait
5 until they become to ten, 11, and 12 years old,
6 and over 7000 kids were identified as SLD. They
7 weren't SLD when they were in kindergarten? I'm
8 sorry. Now I'm getting angry.

9 But those are the things I'm fighting
10 for, and you know, it's not for my daughter. It's
11 for all these other kids. They're smart kids.
12 Dyslexic kids aren't dumb. They're smart.
13 They're smart and we're leaving them on the
14 sidelines. Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, [name
16 redacted].

17 And, finally, we have [name
18 redacted].

19 PUBLIC SPEAKER 5: Hi. I'm [name
20 redacted], and I reside in Guilford County, and I
21 have three children. I have an 18-year-old, who
22 graduated last year from the Guilford County
23 School system, I have a nine-year-old, and I have
24 a six-year-old. My younger two children are
25 dyslexic, and their path through public education

1 has been devastating. It is devastating what is
2 occurring in Guilford County and all over the
3 state of North Carolina.

4 I know some of these ladies that are
5 here today. We didn't talk about what we were
6 going to say. I didn't write anything down to
7 tell you. I didn't last time I came here either,
8 but they have spoken a lot to a lot of the numbers
9 and a lot of what is happening and what isn't
10 happening. I can just tell you that, from a
11 personal standpoint, what is happening is wrong.
12 It is wrong, and it's wrong at every level.

13 My daughter is with me today because
14 she is not in public school any longer. She has
15 private tutors that teach her how to read, write,
16 spell, and do math because she is dyslexic, she
17 has dyscalculia, she has dysgraphia. They all go
18 hand-in-hand. She has ADHD. All of the things
19 that she has are not why she can't read, write,
20 and spell. She cannot read, write, and spell
21 because public school does not value children that
22 are different.

23 They are different and they deserve
24 an education. Every child deserves an education.
25 They are not getting one. They absolutely

1 unequivocally are not, and my children are a
2 testament. We have to do better. You may say to
3 yourself how can we do better. Google
4 Mississippi. Google Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
5 Look and see what they've done. Google the state
6 of Arkansas and see what they've done. They did
7 it from a legislative standpoint. They just got a
8 \$38-million grant from the federal government to
9 train their teachers.

10 Our teachers do not know what
11 dyslexia is. They do not know how to remediate a
12 dyslexic. The reason they don't is because they
13 don't know how to teach reading in a scientific,
14 structured, systematic, direct, and explicit way.
15 I cannot speak to every teacher in the state of
16 North Carolina. I can speak to the teachers that
17 I have personally dealt with. There may be some.

18 I filed Freedom of Information Acts
19 to try to figure out who they were because I was
20 willing to transport my children anywhere within
21 the state of -- excuse me -- within the County of
22 Guilford that could educate my children. My
23 Freedom of Information Act was declined, and they
24 said that they could not tell me that, that that
25 was a private matter, a private matter on who is

1 trained to deliver literacy in a structured way.

2 That's a problem, folks. That's a
3 problem. That's a problem. We're all supposed to
4 be a team. This is a team. We're here -- I have
5 begged the Guilford County school system to help
6 me, begged them with every ounce of everything I
7 have in me. I removed her because it wasn't going
8 to happen. I'm still somewhat hopeful. My son
9 is -- was one of the six -- he was six years old
10 when he was identified. He was identified because
11 I wrote a letter because I knew more. I wrote a
12 letter and I said he needed to be tested.

13 I didn't receive a tremendous amount
14 of pushback, which I was very thankful for. He
15 was identified, but guess what? There's still
16 nobody in the building that knows how to teach
17 him. They still don't know how to teach him.
18 They have no idea. They don't know what phonemic
19 awareness is. My children have a phonemic
20 awareness deficit. That is what dyslexia is.
21 It's mapping sounds with letters. It's reading.

22 If you write an IEP for a child who
23 is dyslexic and they have no phonemic awareness
24 goal because the teachers don't what it is -- and
25 I know they don't, folks. I mean I have so much

1 respect for all of you. I know you're here. I
2 know that -- I know what this Council is. Please
3 help us. You speak to people. You see people.
4 Please say dyslexia. Please ask people to educate
5 themselves. Please educate our teachers.

6 LTRS training. The state of
7 Mississippi trained 14,000 people in LTRS. They
8 are the only state in the United States that have
9 reading [inaudible]. Connect the dots. Our
10 teachers need professional development, and
11 without it, we will remain where we are with
12 children not being taught how to read, write, and
13 spell.

14 There are -- there were two things
15 that I was going to speak to today, and one was
16 professional development. Please, please give
17 teachers professional development. And the other
18 was accountability. There is no accountability.
19 There's absolutely no accountability. There's no
20 personal accountability. There's no professional
21 accountability. There's no accountability through
22 NC DPI. There's no accountability through
23 Guilford County. There's no accountability
24 anywhere because everything is somebody else's
25 department. Everything is somebody else's job.

1 It's all of our jobs. We're all
2 human. We all have the ability to read. Every
3 one of us in this room, more than likely, have the
4 ability to read, and without it, the children of
5 the state of North Carolina will not be what
6 they're destined to be. My children will be what
7 they were destined to be because I have money.
8 There are many children that will not.

9 There is a school in Guilford County
10 that has got a very high African-American
11 population. They have 23 percent proficiency.
12 Why is that school not closed? Why should those
13 children have to attend that school? Why? That
14 is not fair, that is not right, that is not just.
15 It is a complete and total waste of money. Some
16 of those -- it's not poverty. It is not poverty.
17 These children can learn how to read.

18 If 75 percent of the children in a
19 school don't know how to read, it's not the
20 children's fault. If it's not the educators, then
21 you have to -- at some point, it has to fall back
22 on the child, and that is what happened at my
23 daughter's IEP. I will close with this.

24 My beautiful, blonde-haired,
25 blue-eyed daughter, when I said "She's not making

1 progress. Please help me. Please help me. She
2 can't read. She cannot read. She will be
3 illiterate," the school psychologist said, "[Name
4 redacted], you're right."

5 I said, "She's on the path to be
6 functionally illiterate."

7 And the school psychologist said,
8 "[Name redacted], you're right."

9 "Because I volunteer and I work with
10 children." This is me saying this. "I volunteer
11 and I work with children and I try to help them.
12 They don't know how to read when they're in high
13 school. My child will be functionally illiterate
14 at best at the rate she's going. After three and
15 a half years of public school instruction, she's
16 reading at a kindergarten level."

17 The school psychologist said, "You're
18 right, [name redacted]. I work with them every
19 day. Not only do we graduate functionally
20 illiterate children, we graduate illiterate
21 children."

22 And you absolutely do, and we
23 absolutely are, and it's every one of ours -- it's
24 a gen ed issue, it's an EC issue, it's a dyslexia
25 issue, it's a human issue, it's a civil rights

1 issue. Please help us. You're here for a reason.
2 Please help us. Please help the children, all of
3 them, every one of them.

4 The parents that don't know to be
5 here, the parents that don't have the money to
6 come here, the parents that don't have the money
7 to help their children, their children are going
8 to be illiterate. They're going to be illiterate.
9 Please help us. Please.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, [name
11 redacted].

12 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: Miss
13 Chair?

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

15 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: I've got
16 a question. As a lawmaker that works in those two
17 buildings over there---

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: I know. I've
19 visited you over there a time or two. It's been
20 awhile, though.

21 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: And this
22 is my first meeting, but I've listened very
23 intensely to these ladies for the last hour, and I
24 guess what I would like to know is the process of
25 the minutes. I'm assuming they're being recorded,

1 every comment they made. How soon will those
2 minutes be ready for us as members of this board
3 to have?

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Don't we have a
5 full transcript that will be available? I know it
6 takes time usually.

7 MS. SANDERS: It's also being
8 streamed live so that will be available, and the
9 minutes, probably within the week, will be
10 available on the website.

11 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: I think
12 some of my fellow colleagues really need to read
13 some of these comments that have been made today.
14 Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: I know that [name
16 redacted] was going to send in some written
17 comment as well to the Council, and I will make
18 sure that she gets that to everybody who would
19 like a copy of her written comment.

20 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: Thank
21 you.

22 MS. MOOREFIELD: I'm sorry. I want
23 to make sure I use your correct title.
24 Representative Strickland?

25 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: Uh-huh.

1 MS. MOOREFIELD: Hallelujah. Thank
2 you for showing up.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: You're the first
4 one I've seen in a long time.

5 MS. MOOREFIELD: For somebody coming
6 over here that's supposed to be here from those
7 two buildings over there. Thank you.

8 REPRESENTATIVE STRICKLAND: Well, we
9 spend quite a bit of money here in North Carolina
10 on education, and we try to increase that and get
11 good results from that. So when I hear these type
12 comments, it really -- I know it concerns many in
13 state legislative buildings, and I just -- I want
14 to have those comments to take back to my
15 colleagues.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll do everything
17 we can to make sure you get them. Did you want to
18 say something, [name redacted]?

19 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: Yes, ma'am.
20 Sorry. And I have to be leaving, but I'll send
21 information to this lady here.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Danyelle.

23 PUBLIC SPEAKER 2: Okay. So I'll get
24 your email address. But my son is fine. I mean
25 I'm here for all of the kids in North Carolina,

1 and let me tell you, sir, thank you for being
2 here. And now I have the knowledge because there
3 is not only ingredients to teach all children to
4 read, there's an exact recipe that works every
5 single time.

6 I can teach a child to read without
7 any fancy curriculum, without spending a million
8 dollars on textbooks. I can teach them with note
9 cards and old books. We are wasting taxpayer
10 dollars, we are wasting lives, and our children
11 are suffering. Our teachers are begging for
12 answers.

13 And the whole MTSS is put in place so
14 that kids can get help earlier, and in North
15 Carolina, it looks like it's a delay, which is
16 against the law. And even if they're in MTSS and
17 the tiered system, it does not bar a parent from
18 requesting educational testing, which is happening
19 day after day after day because I get emails
20 because people say [inaudible].

21 I spend my days trying to put out
22 fires for you-all. That's why I decided to come
23 here. I want to be a part of the solution, and I
24 want to help you get the answers because I found
25 out so much in my journey. It is very easy to

1 teach every single child to read. So thank you
2 all for your time.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank
4 you for the comments from the Council as well. I
5 think next we have -- we did the voting already
6 and public comments.

7 We still need to do the dispute
8 resolution annual report with Ms. King. Thank you
9 for allowing us to do the public comment first.

10 MS. KING: Good afternoon. I'm
11 Teresa King, Dispute Resolution Consultant,
12 Facilitator, Mediator, Mediation, Due Process,
13 State Complaints, a little bit of it all, and
14 Corrective Action Coordinator.

15 Okay. So I have some proposed policy
16 updates that came from our Section Chief for
17 Policy, Monitoring, and Audit. An internal EC
18 Division workgroup has been initiated to review
19 and develop proposals for the revision of the
20 definitions of the required screenings and
21 evaluations that goes with Policy NC 1500(2).11,
22 Evaluation," and (b), "Definitions of Evaluations
23 and Screenings."

24 So the purpose of the review, one, is
25 to ensure definitions are sufficiently

1 comprehensive to yield the data needed to inform
2 eligibility and programming decisions in
3 development of an IEP; two, to clearly identify
4 those screenings that require parental consent and
5 eliminate confusion with screening for initial
6 purposes; and, three, provide enough detail
7 regarding the evaluation procedures needed to
8 administer and interpret the results of
9 assessments/evaluations.

10 This review is not intended to alter
11 eligibility requirements for disability
12 categories. For example, the functional behavior
13 assessment, the FBA, no current policy definition
14 is there. Adapted physical education evaluation,
15 currently no definition is there. The timeline
16 right now is a tentative timeline. The internal
17 workgroup cross-section of the EC Division will
18 put forth its proposals by January 1st to the EC
19 Division leadership team.

20 The leadership team will then provide
21 feedback and recommendations to the internal
22 group. February through March, public comments
23 period to include Council presentation. April and
24 May, proposal to the State Board of Education and
25 implementation with a date of July 1, 2020.

1 Factors that will impact this timeline will be the
2 scope of recommendations, will the field need
3 additional training prior to the implementation
4 date, and ensuring sufficient communication loops
5 have occurred for the stakeholders.

6 Now I'll give you the dispute
7 resolution annual report. So this will consist of
8 2018-2019 data, and this data is also on the
9 website at this time. All right. So we have
10 written and signed complaints. The total number
11 of complaints filed was 130. The Department
12 issued 96 reports. There were 73 noncompliant.
13 92 were issued within the 60-day timeline. Two
14 were issued with extended timelines. We had 34
15 complaints that were withdrawn or dismissed.
16 There are no complaints pending at this time from
17 the '18-19 school year.

18 Mediation requests, we had 83. Of
19 those 83, 48 mediations were held. 31 of those
20 were related to due process complaints. 21
21 reached agreements related to the due process
22 complaints. Mediations that were not related to
23 due process were 17. Nine agreements not related
24 to due process was agreed upon. We had -- at the
25 time of this report, there were nine mediations

1 pending and 26 mediations were withdrawn or not
2 held. Question?

3 MS. MOOREFIELD: Hi, Ms. King. I
4 wanted to ask, the complaints that are being
5 filed, are those only for academics or do they
6 deal with anything related to school services?

7 MS. KING: Anything related to IDEA.

8 MS. MOOREFIELD: IDEA?

9 MS. KING: Uh-huh.

10 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. Would that --
11 help me out -- would that include special
12 transportation for students with disabilities,
13 IEPs, and everything?

14 MS. KING: Yes.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: Then, like I know of
16 a complaint that has been ongoing, has not been
17 resolved, is still an issue. So the complaints
18 that come in, are these the ones that come in
19 through the -- this is at the state-level,
20 correct?

21 MS. KING: This is only for state
22 complaints, not due process.

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. So this would
24 not be county?

25 MS. KING: Right.

1 MS. MOOREFIELD: Got it. Okay.

2 MS. KING: Well, it could be county.

3 However, did the parent file through a state

4 complaint---

5 MS. MOOREFIELD: They filed through

6 the county. So this is only for the state?

7 MS. KING: Okay. So that's the

8 county. This is only through the state, yes.

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. All right.

10 I've got it. Thank you.

11 MS. KING: All right. So the due

12 process complaints filed, we had 92. There were

13 38 resolution meetings. 13 of those reached an

14 agreement in the resolution meeting. We had six

15 that were fully adjudicated, which means they go

16 all the way through the process and a judge

17 renders a final decision. We had six decisions

18 within the timeline to include the expedited. We

19 had 22 due process complaints pending, and 64

20 complaints were withdrawn or dismissed. That

21 meant they were withdrawn without a hearing.

22 Expedited due process, these are

23 related to disciplinary decisions. There were

24 two. One had a resolution meeting and one was

25 done with a written settlement agreement. So that

1 takes care of those, and those two were withdrawn.
2 Both of those were withdrawn and dismissed.

3 Okay. Are there any questions about
4 the data?

5 MS. GRANT: Teresa, you may have said
6 this, so excuse me if I missed it. Facilitated
7 IEP meetings, how many of those does the State do
8 and do they fall within either one of those
9 categories? You can get that to me at any time,
10 but do we have data on how many of those were done
11 throughout the state that may have prevented---

12 MS. KING: Yes, I do have
13 facilitation data. This data right here is what
14 is reported to federal because facilitation is not
15 federally-mandated. So I do have the facilitation
16 data, and I can send that to you individually if
17 you would like that information.

18 MS. GRANT: Okay.

19 MS. HUTCHINSON: I just have a
20 comment about transparency because we had all
21 those visitors that wanted to speak. I asked them
22 about going before you, you know, with the
23 schedule, and they asked about what your
24 presentation was, and I said it was this, and they
25 had all asked for that information. So I wonder

1 how we can get that presentation and just make it
2 public, or if we have their emails---

3 MS. KING: This information is all
4 online.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: This is all online.

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's all online.

7 MS. KING: It's all online.

8 MS. HUTCHINSON: But I just thought
9 it would be nice for those folks---

10 MS. KING: The only thing that's not
11 there is facilitation, and that's because it's not
12 a federal report.

13 MS. HUTCHINSON: Federal mandate.

14 MS. KING: Yes.

15 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. I just
16 thought it would be nice -- since we have their
17 emails, it would be nice to shoot them the
18 presentation because they weren't able to stay.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Nobody gave their
20 emails.

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: They didn't?

22 MS. GRANT: Oh, no.

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Never mind.
24 I just thought -- they were interested and they
25 approached me about it, so -- oh, well. I tried.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you
2 for that, Teresa, and for your patience today.

3 Would you rather us go ahead and
4 discuss this first and then move on to committee
5 work? Since you're going to be the Chair---

6 MS. DANIELS-HALL: I think we should
7 discuss this first because we want to get this
8 done.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that has to
10 get done. That's more critical.

11 MS. DANIELS-HALL: So Diane and I had
12 a little side conversation during lunch, and we
13 talked about one thing that we think is most
14 pressing, and that's 3c. And on the proficiency
15 on state assessments, we thought -- when we're
16 looking at this data and seeing that we're at 20
17 percent and 20 percent and 22.67 percent and our
18 actual target was 56 percent -- 56.40 percent for
19 third to eighth-graders and then 54.70 percent for
20 the eleventh-graders in math and then 57 percent
21 for the tenth-graders in reading, we thought that
22 we would want to suggest to the group that we
23 maintain the actual target that we have, but we
24 believe that we need additional data.

25 We need to know how we are finding

1 ourselves here at this point, why do we have these
2 numbers, and what those numbers actually mean. So
3 we believe that we need from Nancy or from
4 whomever can provide us the additional data that
5 we're going to need as we go forward to make that
6 five-year suggestion to proposals when we're doing
7 the five-year plan in a year. But since this is
8 just a year and this data is so poor, in our
9 opinion, that we need more information. We need
10 data. Any thoughts?

11 MS. HUTCHINSON: Are you saying data
12 like you want it broken out by area of
13 exceptionality or---

14 MS. DANIELS-HALL: We want it broken
15 out by area of exceptionality. We want to know
16 where the deficits are, is it a major -- is it all
17 over across all disabilities or is it occurring in
18 certain disabilities and even if we can get
19 information about race.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Socioeconomic and
21 cultural diversity.

22 MS. COFFEY: Yeah. Because we're
23 looking at better than 30 percent from actual data
24 than what we're trying to achieve, and which I
25 mean the 50 percent range is not -- I mean it's

1 not great achievement asking for, anyway, but
2 we're not even at that.

3 MS. DANIELS-HALL: And to ask for an
4 increase [inaudible].

5 MS. COFFEY: So where is the problem
6 of why we're anywhere near?

7 MS. MOOREFIELD: That's what I was --
8 that's what I was, you know, trying to ask her, is
9 that in this -- you know, in these current numbers
10 that we have that are less than 20 percent, are
11 you -- because if you're lumping in the entire
12 spectrum of disabilities, you've got kids who --
13 they may have ADHD, and then you've got kids that
14 they don't even know where they are right now, I
15 mean, you know, and they have no physical way to
16 participate fully in an assessment.

17 That's what I was saying, like those
18 numbers don't do us any good---

19 MR. BAKER: I agree.

20 MS. MOOREFIELD: ---because we
21 don't know -- I mean you can't compare apples and
22 bananas.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, it's my
24 understanding that for 3c, those that -- I mean
25 we're doing 95 percent for 3b. 95 percent

1 participation -- that five percent is not---

2 MS. MOOREFIELD: Right. But that
3 participation -- that doesn't---

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: What I'm saying,
5 though, is that five percent that it would really
6 be a challenge to get to participate fully are not
7 being counted in that, are they?

8 MS. HUTCHINSON: No. It's over 95
9 percent so that it's not identifiable. And over
10 95 percent, like when we have targets, they just
11 say over 95 percent. That number is not where we
12 need to spend our time worrying about.

13 MS. MOOREFIELD: No. I'm just saying
14 it's the proficiency that we need to look at.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: What I'm saying is
16 that that five percent, though, is not impacting
17 3c at all, so I mean---

18 MS. MOOREFIELD: No.

19 MR. BAKER: No.

20 MS. MOOREFIELD: No. And parents do
21 have -- they can like opt out?

22 MS. HUTCHINSON: [Inaudible] fragile
23 kid that's, you know, doing treatment and---

24 MS. MOOREFIELD: They can opt out,
25 right?

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

3 MS. GRANT: Yes, some parents do opt
4 out.

5 MS. HUTCHINSON: But that's not where
6 we need to [inaudible].

7 MS. COFFEY: 3c, to us, we've got to
8 get more of a picture of what's behind that.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: I agree.

10 MS. GRANT: I think looking at it too
11 at individual grades to see where is there --
12 elementary, middle, high -- is there a grade level
13 where we're seeing -- are we seeing some of our
14 students who meet good cause exceptions go on to
15 fourth grade and do they never recover from that
16 because we're already saying that they're not
17 proficient. That has been very eye-opening for us
18 as a district, is looking at it by grade, also
19 looking at it by those that test with the Extended
20 Content Standards versus the standard assessments
21 and seeing the differences there with that.

22 The other thing that I just want to
23 point out -- I'm an exceptional children's
24 director, and I try to be knowledgeable in all
25 areas, but the accountability director in our

1 district has really become my friend in trying to
2 understand the North Carolina ESSA state plan.
3 And if you pull up that plan and you truly look at
4 where as a state they're saying that the students
5 with disabilities subgroup has to be -- and this
6 is just for the high school reading, which would
7 be our target -- was at 57 percent there. In
8 1920, we are supposed to be between 22.7
9 percent---

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: You mean 2020?

11 MS. GRANT: ---22.7 percent to meet
12 our ten-year percent improvement to get up to 45
13 percent in '26-27. So I think it's worth taking
14 some time, if you haven't looked at the ESSA --
15 the North Carolina ESSA plan that was approved by
16 the federal government, to really look at that so
17 you can get a grasp like that's not okay to me.

18 And what that does, though, is take
19 it off of the '15-16 baseline. So they're saying
20 in '15-16, the baseline performance was 13
21 percent, and here's what it's going to take you
22 over a ten-year period to improve up to 45
23 percent. And that's not okay. I tell my people
24 all the time it's not okay. I mean until we're
25 like way high up there in percentages, we're not

1 done, right?

2 But I just -- I want to kind of put
3 that in perspective, but I do feel like the
4 Exceptional Children Division took a much higher
5 stance, even though it doesn't seem that way when
6 you look at 50 percent. Putting it into
7 perspective a little bit, when I look at what our
8 North Carolina ESSA plan, accountability state
9 plan says for everybody, it's much lower.

10 So I agree with you on keeping it
11 where that -- maintaining where that is and then
12 asking for some additional information so we can
13 kind of see where we -- where we are and how we
14 can go in and offer some suggestions for
15 improvement. That would be great.

16 MS. HUTCHINSON: One thing to add to
17 what Christy said, our state plan was approved by
18 the federal government. Those targets are so much
19 lower than what we have here. So the federal
20 government has approved our State Improvement
21 Plan, and the targets are here, and we have
22 targets here. I don't think that should change,
23 like she said, but it's just not---

24 MS. COFFEY: But in the end, does the
25 target really matter if we're nowhere near it?

1 MS. GRANT: No. You're exactly
2 right. I agree.

3 MS. COFFEY: I mean in the end if
4 we're at 20 -- and we've not grown. I mean we
5 were less than 20 percent in 2012. We're still
6 less than 20 percent. So, to me, the target's a
7 moot point almost at this point till we our kids
8 somewhere near it.

9 MS. GRANT: I would like to see some
10 growth data too like because our kids our growing,
11 but we're not growing at a percentage that's ever
12 going to catch up at a rate that's going to get us
13 where we need to be at such small gains. So I
14 would like to see -- and that's one thing often
15 people don't look at -- is the actual growth data
16 of the students with disabilities as well.

17 MS. MOOREFIELD: I think what you
18 just said answers one of my questions. I just
19 want to make sure. So like when we have -- so we
20 have this huge spectrum of disabilities. If some
21 of those kids take regular ed standardized tests
22 and then some of them take the extend -- you know,
23 I know how the extend standards compare to like
24 regular ed standards, but as far as the
25 assessment -- I mean, of course, I've never

1 been -- you know, I'm not able to see it. I don't
2 know what's on those. I don't know how they're
3 administered.

4 But for kids who have severe
5 disabilities and like their growth for that year
6 might have been they can now -- maybe it's a
7 16-year-old student who can now recognize and
8 identify red, blue, and yellow, and that's huge.
9 So when they're assessed, are they assessed on
10 what they've actually been able to do or are they
11 assessed on those standards?

12 MS. GRANT: They're assessed on the
13 Extended Content Standards, and it's a pretty
14 rigorous---

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: And that's by grade
16 level, right?

17 MS. GRANT: ---standard course of
18 study and rigorous assessment.

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: So even if that
20 16-year-old made huge gains in this what seems to
21 us as this tiny, tiny little improvement, but
22 they're still being measured on grade--- What
23 would that be? Like tenth, a 16-year-old?
24 ---like grade ten extended standards?

25 MS. GRANT: Yes. It's just---

1 MR. BAKER: Yes.

2 MS. GRANT: Go ahead.

3 MR. BAKER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

4 MS. GRANT: No. Go ahead. Go ahead.

5 I'd love to hear your perspective.

6 MR. BAKER: I was just going to say,
7 and keep in mind too that we still have some
8 students that are still having great challenges,
9 but they don't qualify to be on the Extended
10 Content Standards. So you have those kids that
11 are taking the regular---

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. So there's a
13 group of kids---

14 MR. BAKER: ---standard assessments,
15 the EOGs and EOCs, and they're struggling with
16 those. And so that, again, is where some of our
17 numbers are bottoming out.

18 MS. MOOREFIELD: So you're saying
19 that -- so there's like the group of kids with
20 disabilities but who can still take like just the
21 regular ed assessments, there's the group that
22 takes the extend, and then there's also a group
23 that---

24 MS. HUTCHINSON: The old Extend 2
25 kids is what we say---

1 MR. BAKER: Since there is no Extend
2 2 anymore, so those kids that---

3 MS. MOOREFIELD: But they could
4 not---

5 MR. BAKER: ---would normally have
6 been maybe on that other Extend 2, they're taking
7 the regular assessment.

8 MS. MOOREFIELD: ---they could not
9 really be expected to even do the extend, so
10 they're not -- they're not included in this?

11 MS. GRANT: They are.

12 MR. BAKER: They're included.
13 They're included in this, but what we're saying
14 is---

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: But they're not
16 measured -- they're not measured?

17 MR. BAKER: Right.

18 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. And the
19 reason that I'm asking this is because one thing
20 that I faced with---

21 MS. GRANT: They're there.

22 MS. HUTCHINSON: Their data is in
23 there, but I think what his point is, is that test
24 is not accessible for them. They are not
25 appropriately placed on the Extend 1---

1 MR. BAKER: Correct.

2 MS. HUTCHINSON: ---so their numbers
3 are showing in the traditional assessments as not
4 proficient---

5 MR. BAKER: Yes.

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: ---when we know in
7 reality---

8 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. See, now
9 that's -- so that's the problem that I have with
10 this and that I was trying to get at, is that I
11 kind of came upon an administrator in one of my
12 son's schools who "[Vocal imitation], I don't want
13 these kids to take -- you know, because they're
14 pulling our numbers down."

15 Oh, huh-uh. If it takes my kid a
16 year to be able to meet this one standard, you
17 better darn well praise him for meeting that one
18 standard. So I don't -- I don't want -- I don't
19 want kids to feel -- now I know that kids are
20 never going to see these, but I don't want
21 programs that are working hard to get those
22 measurable progresses for that particular child
23 and what they can do -- I don't them punished
24 because they're being -- they're being measured
25 against impossible standards.

1 MR. BAKER: Yes.

2 MS. MOOREFIELD: You know what I'm
3 saying? So that's why I was asking her, within
4 these statistics, can we break it down--- I don't
5 know if we need to break it down by -- what's the
6 word I want? Not label, but disability category.

7 MS. HUTCHINSON: Classification.

8 MS. MOOREFIELD: Classification.

9 MS. HUTCHINSON: Area of
10 exceptionality.

11 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah, area of
12 exceptionality. I don't know if we want to break
13 it down that specifically, if we want to break it
14 down just versus like mild, moderate, severe
15 disability. But I don't think that it's fair -- I
16 don't think it's fair to the schools, I don't
17 think it's fair to the teachers who were being
18 held responsible for these numbers, and I don't
19 think it's fair to the kids and families who are
20 constantly being told that your kid is not good
21 enough and your kid is not proficient and your kid
22 is -- when [vocal imitation] my kid's amazing.

23 So, you know, I don't want -- but if
24 you're going to compare him to a physically
25 able-bodied, verbal child, well, then, no, but

1 that's not -- and his teacher should not be
2 penalized by a number that says that they're
3 not -- they're not measuring up.

4 MR. BAKER: Sure. Sure.

5 MS. GRANT: Yeah. And they're not
6 penalized, I would say. And the one thing I will
7 tell you -- and I agree with what you're saying.
8 The one thing that bothers me, not about what
9 you're saying but about our accountability system,
10 is that we do not get growth data for our Extended
11 Content Standards students.

12 For those that take Extend 1, that's
13 the piece to me that I hold so much weight in, and
14 we simply can't get it because the way --
15 supposedly, when I asked the way the test is
16 given, the statistical analysis of the test is
17 subjective, so you can't really get growth. Well,
18 then, figure it out because I want to see how our
19 Extended Content Standards kids are growing
20 because for some of our kids that are tested, like
21 our very lowest performing children, that little
22 bit of growth means so much to parents---

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: It's huge.

24 MS. GRANT: ---because they don't
25 always see the proficiency, but to see that growth

1 is huge.

2 MS. MOOREFIELD: It is. I mean, you
3 know, like -- and I know that I only have, you
4 know, real experience with just my one kid, but
5 it's taken him ten years to be able to get his
6 brain to connect with the parts of his body in
7 order to make his left foot go in front of his
8 right foot. It's taken ten years.

9 So it's not fair -- now cognitively,
10 though, he's all there, but it takes him so long
11 to get a message from his brain to a body part to
12 make it do what he wants it to do, that for him to
13 take an assessment -- he knows the information,
14 but it takes so long for him to demonstrate that
15 he knows that information.

16 So kids like that, kids with, you
17 know, whatever, to be compared with kids with mild
18 learning disabilities, that's not -- that number
19 is useless because then we don't know what we need
20 to do to support teachers or support classes or
21 whatever to bring those numbers up.

22 MR. BAKER: That is correct. And
23 herein lies the issue that we have and the
24 challenge that we have. All of the information
25 that is publicized is always about proficiency,

1 talks about how well the kids are doing as far as
2 how they measured on these end-of-year
3 assessments. So did my child make a 3, 4, or 5.

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: Right.

5 MR. BAKER: Okay. So, then, we've
6 got to keep up with -- not only are we talking
7 about the proficiency, even more so what's
8 publicized is are they college and career ready.
9 So then we're not looking at 3's, and we're
10 talking about the 4's and the 5's.

11 But what's important to us, as you
12 mentioned, is the growth. If we actually looked
13 at the growth here, these numbers would be a whole
14 lot better than what we're seeing right here.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah, and they'd be
16 more encouraging.

17 MR. BAKER: And that's not what the
18 public gets to see, not even the parents get to
19 see it because it's not shared.

20 MS. MOOREFIELD: Right. They would
21 also -- I've mentioned before, in the World
22 Language Department of North Carolina Public
23 Schools, we -- you know, we test-drove an ASW
24 process that measured growth. It did not -- we
25 did not care if a kid made an A, a B, a C, a D, or

1 whatever.

2 We measured growth for each standard
3 that we taught, and -- and I liked that concept.
4 Like getting it to be efficient enough to use on a
5 huge scale, that would be the issue, but to be
6 able to see that, you know, there has been growth,
7 you're at least going in the right direction, and
8 you're building on that because no kid is
9 standard, and we all know that.

10 So I just -- I was worried that these
11 numbers are going to make decisions that they
12 don't necessarily reflect, and I just lost my
13 other train of thought.

14 MS. JOHNSON: I would just say --
15 when you were talking about mild, moderate, severe
16 and whether we should do it that way or by the
17 area of exceptionality, I mean just based on what
18 we hear from parents here saying that we're not
19 using science-based practices in dyslexia, for
20 example---

21 And I work in the field of autism. I
22 don't work in the public schools. I work in the
23 private sector, but I do a lot of work in the
24 public schools, and I would say I feel the same
25 way in terms of what I see in terms of instruction

1 happening in the world of autism.

2 And so I think it would be very
3 interesting to see where the breakdown is to try
4 to potentially identify those areas where a
5 greater emphasis on truly evidence-based practices
6 makes the difference in proficiency. So I would
7 say classifications or exceptionality is a
8 critical piece of that.

9 And then I don't know how you get at
10 what are the practices that are being used. I
11 mean I don't know how that's then tied back to
12 that---

13 MS. COFFEY: It's so different---

14 MS. JOHNSON: ---like the schools
15 don't---

16 MS. HUTCHINSON: That wouldn't be
17 something you could pull off an IEP [inaudible].

18 THE COURT REPORTER: Guys---

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Speak into your
20 mikes.

21 THE COURT REPORTER: ---one at a
22 time, please. I'm losing you when everybody talks
23 at one time. Okay.

24 MS. HUTCHINSON: An IEP wouldn't
25 capture the resource used.

1 MS. MOOREFIELD: And that's one of
2 the drawbacks of being a local control.

3 MS. HUTCHINSON: And the only thing I
4 would cautious us to just be a little mindful
5 about is the area of exceptionality is going to --
6 like if you were problem-solving with a team and
7 you wanted to dive deeper into your data, this is
8 masking our data. So area of exceptionality would
9 give us the red flag like, oh, our TBI kids in
10 middle school are not making any growth, but our
11 TBI kids in elementary area.

12 Like that would give us a nice data
13 dive, but it might be nice to also consider their
14 service delivery model because we have specific
15 learning disability students that are in the
16 regular setting 80 percent or more of the day and
17 then we have specific learning disability students
18 that are, you know, 85 to 90 percent of their day
19 in a special ed classroom and we have students who
20 are autistic who are at this end of the spectrum
21 of service.

22 So area of exceptionality doesn't
23 speak to their ability in any way. So it might be
24 good to kind of do a tiered approach to area of
25 exceptionality and service delivery model. Do you

1 see what I'm saying?

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Uh-huh. Yeah.

3 MS. JOHNSON: When you say "service
4 delivery model---"

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Placement.

6 MS. JOHNSON: ---do you mean like
7 regular ed versus---

8 MS. HUTCHINSON: I mean like how much
9 time are they in regular, resource, and---

10 MS. JOHNSON: No, I mean I agree. I
11 think the more you can break it down and like
12 disaggregate the data, the more you can glean from
13 it.

14 MS. HUTCHINSON: We do have access to
15 data -- I don't remember how we got it, and I
16 think it was Nancy that had it. We do have data
17 that tells us the areas of exceptionality of
18 students on Extend 1 and on the continuum. I
19 can't remember how that was presented to us, but I
20 think what you're looking for here is the testing
21 data.

22 MS. GRANT: That was for the one for
23 our state being over the one percent requirement
24 for testing on the Extended Content Standards, and
25 that was presented at that time.

1 MS. MOOREFIELD: Like while we're
2 talking about kind of breaking down, you know, so
3 that we can see specifically what needs to be
4 happening, is there a way for--- One of the
5 parents mentioned -- you know, I think she was
6 looking at a Freedom of Information Act or
7 something. She wanted to know, okay, where is
8 this particular method used.

9 Is there a way for teachers within
10 North Carolina to share resources and find
11 resources? So like if I'm teaching in an AU class
12 and I'm having huge success with my, you know,
13 numbers, or however all that's measured, and then
14 for other teachers in North Carolina or even
15 parents to say, okay, we need to strengthen our AU
16 program, and for them to find other teachers, you
17 know, that we could have more collaboration about
18 what works and what doesn't work like sharing
19 ideas? Is that a thing?

20 MS. HUTCHINSON: The State's website
21 has like best practices for each---

22 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah, but there's
23 best practices and then there's what actually
24 works. I mean, you know what I'm saying? Like
25 if -- like just those different resources.

1 Because I might have found something on my own,
2 you know, that I'm using in my classroom that
3 works or I might have a particular kid who---

4 You know, as a regular ed teacher,
5 I'm like okay because they were right. Teachers
6 don't know how to -- I've had three students with
7 autism. I don't know the first thing about
8 autism, and I certainly don't know how to reach
9 those children in a silent classroom. So like a
10 way for teachers to collaborate about different --
11 like find out where AU classrooms are -- not
12 classrooms maybe, but like teachers or just
13 something -- some kind of networking
14 collaboration, does that exist?

15 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Is that happening
16 at the LEA level with the professional
17 development?

18 MS. GRANT: In our district, it
19 absolutely is.

20 MR. BAKER: It's happening in ours as
21 well.

22 MS. GRANT: We do look at those,
23 especially we pair our like beginning teachers,
24 zero to five years, with -- often there's not
25 mentors within their schools that truly can

1 understand, especially like someone in a
2 self-contained classroom, so we pair them up with
3 somebody else. We also have a curriculum design
4 team at our level that just focuses on Extended
5 Content Standards.

6 I think one thing for me is, like I
7 can get a list and see who our top 25 percent at
8 the state level are and who are our top 25 percent
9 in regular ed in our district, but because
10 teachers in self-contained and Extended Content
11 Standards are excluded from that legislation,
12 which really bothers me, but anyway, I can't see
13 who are the ones in the state that are the top 25
14 percent that could [inaudible].

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: What's excluded from
16 what?

17 MS. GRANT: Our teachers that teach
18 in Extended Content Standards classrooms and
19 self-contained classrooms or adapted curriculum,
20 they're not -- where our teachers that work in
21 regular ed classrooms or like my co-teachers that
22 are paired and co-teaching with a third grade
23 regular ed teacher, those that get the bonuses and
24 everything for being the top 25 percent at the
25 state level and top 25 at the local level, our

1 teachers that are in the adapted and self-
2 contained classrooms are excluded from that
3 calculation.

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: So the teachers who
5 need the most support because they're islands are
6 not able---

7 MS. HUTCHINSON: No. They're kept
8 out of the bonus structure because they don't have
9 eval data.

10 MS. GRANT: Because there's no growth
11 data. So I can't look to see where are the top 25
12 percent in the state in our Extended Content
13 Standards to know that there's a best practice
14 there that I want to figure out. We do it in the
15 LEA. I would say, "What are you doing in your
16 classroom that's gotten you this much growth? I
17 mean, how have you done that?" But you can't do
18 that.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's where the
20 conference is so nice.

21 MS. MOOREFIELD: So self-contained
22 teachers -- they're not being measured on
23 anything?

24 MS. GRANT: It's because there's
25 no -- we can't -- they can't figure out how to

1 calculate growth.

2 MS. JOHNSON: You mentioned that
3 earlier---

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: I'm going to be at
5 your office later, and we're going to be talking
6 about this.

7 MS. JOHNSON: ---but you said -- just
8 now you said that you look at it and you're able
9 to see the growth. So how are you doing it?

10 MS. GRANT: I cannot tell you the
11 statistical formula or how my accountability
12 director does it, but she pulls -- from the data
13 that comes from the State, she pulls that for me
14 to see -- we actually just look at where the kids
15 were last year, where they are now, and then we
16 look at them from a cohort perspective versus
17 that.

18 I could not do that by myself,
19 though. I mean she's the one that really has to
20 pull and manipulate the data. I don't know if
21 you-all do anything.

22 MR. BAKER: It's the same way with
23 us. It's shared with our director and our EC
24 director, and then it's shared out to the
25 administrators at the local schools.

1 MS. UTZ: And just a comment. Marge
2 commented here that the NC Council for Exceptional
3 Children offers opportunities for EC teachers to
4 network across the state.

5 MS. GRANT: Yes, I did forget about
6 that.

7 MS. HUTCHINSON: Leanna, you had made
8 a quiet pitch---

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: The conference.

10 MS. HUTCHINSON: ---but the best
11 professional involvement we could ever send our
12 teachers to is the EC conference." There's
13 nothing that compares.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Unfortunately, it
15 happens during November when our teachers have to
16 be in the classroom versus talking to each other
17 about how great their program for reading is or
18 what have you.

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. Just one more
20 just to make sure that I have understood what I
21 think I have understood. So it is possible, not
22 probable but possible, for self-contained
23 classrooms to be a glorified day care?

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Uh-huh.

25 MS. GRANT: Not in Nash-Rocky Mount

1 Public Schools. But, yes, if you're not in the
2 classrooms a lot, if your administrators are not
3 truly paying attention to what's going on. I will
4 tell you, from what my teachers say now, there's
5 no way they can because they want the kids to
6 grow. They want the proficiency to be there and
7 they want the growth with their kids and they want
8 to see their kids do.

9 And to be a glorified day care with
10 the standards the way they are now and as rigorous
11 as everything is, there's no way that can happen.

12 MR. BAKER: We've got targets that
13 we've got to meet.

14 MS. GRANT: Yeah, you do.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: But who makes sure
16 that they're being met? Because for two years, I
17 found out, after the fact, that my child was in a
18 glorified day care, and boy howdy, I came across
19 the table. So---

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's where data
21 collection comes in so handy, and it has to be on
22 an individual-by-individual basis because where---

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: But who's doing that
24 collection?

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's the teacher.

1 MS. GRANT: My teachers do it and
2 [inaudible].

3 MS. MOOREFIELD: But who are the
4 teachers accountable to?

5 MS. HUTCHINSON: The building
6 administrators.

7 MS. GRANT: The building
8 administrators, it runs through them, and then we
9 review the data three times a year to make sure
10 that the progress monitoring---

11 MS. MOOREFIELD: So when the building
12 administrator views that class as doing nothing
13 but pulling their numbers down and they take
14 equipment out of there because it's better used in
15 other classrooms where students can actually use
16 it, that's a problem.

17 MS. GRANT: It's a problem. I've not
18 experienced it in my district.

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: This is my
20 personal. So it's up to -- it's up to the
21 administrators to hold the self-contained teachers
22 accountable for what they're doing. So if the
23 administrator hypothetically says "Oh, nobody's
24 gotten hurt today. Must have been a good day,"
25 that's good enough for the State?

1 MR. BAKER: Well, I can tell you
2 this: That administrator's not going to last too
3 long---

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: Well, they haven't.
5 I've been through two of them.

6 MR. BAKER: ---because there's got to
7 be some growth with every student population, and
8 so if they're not monitoring that---

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: Theoretically, yes.

10 MR. BAKER: ---and that data is not
11 there, then they're not going to keep that job.

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: But the thing is,
13 though, is if they're the end of the line for
14 accountability---

15 MR. BAKER: Well, one thing I will
16 say with our district too, we've got a great EC
17 director, we've great program coordinators, and
18 we've got a great mentoring program and everything
19 in place for all of our teachers, that they come
20 through on a regular basis.

21 It is scheduled, and we
22 administrators know -- because we use a shared
23 calendar -- we know what's going on, and we're all
24 there and present and making sure that the right
25 things and the right instruction is occurring in

1 all of our classrooms including our adapted
2 curriculum classrooms.

3 MS. MOOREFIELD: But that's you.

4 MR. BAKER: But that should be -- it
5 should be the case everywhere.

6 MS. MOOREFIELD: I just need to know
7 that I'm valid in my indignation.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, we've got the
9 cream of the crop here. That's the problem.

10 MS. JOHNSON: I have just a couple of
11 more comments on this, not related to number 3c.
12 But one question I had, I thought it was
13 interesting, on the educational environments
14 especially after -- it was like either the last
15 council meeting or the one before, we had the
16 folks from -- maybe it was the Exceptional
17 Children's Advocacy Council or Center or another
18 group, and they were talking about the concerns
19 about homebound.

20 MS. GRANT: It was Disability Rights.

21 MS. JOHNSON: Disability Rights.

22 Thank you. I knew it was one of those. That
23 there are -- there were no data reported on
24 regarding homebound instruction. Can we request
25 that?

1 And then my other one was, there was
2 a comment made about how -- I think she said some
3 states do the parent surveys where everyone has an
4 opportunity and then they call it like a consensus
5 survey. If you're having trouble getting enough
6 people to participate anyway, it seems a good
7 recommendation would be to send it to more people.
8 I don't know why we wouldn't do that, if there is
9 a mechanism by which you can.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. I have
11 listed as a discussion -- to have parent
12 involvement surveys as a discussion that we have
13 Nancy later on [inaudible]. I mean I know for one
14 Disability Rights North Carolina does their annual
15 target survey. I figured something of a
16 similar -- you know, where we send it out for any
17 parent of a child with a disability that's
18 enrolled in a public school system, you know, but
19 that would probably be the way to do it, is to --
20 but, of course, keep it short and simple and to
21 the point.

22 MS. HUTCHINSON: Right now, it's 25
23 questions.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, 25 questions.
25 I don't know. I'd probably get tired after five.

1 MS. GRANT: I do know they've changed
2 the way they've done it over the years to try to
3 get more participation, and even this past year,
4 like she said, they did allow some parents to do
5 it electronically versus paper-pencil. So I think
6 they're open too, from what I hope when talking
7 with them. They've already talked about reducing
8 the number of questions and getting some feedback
9 on that. So that would be a good conversation to
10 have.

11 MS. UTZ: And I believe that is
12 something that I'm going to start working on in
13 January because I did start working on a survey to
14 send out to someone -- I'm not sure who yet --
15 with questions related to the survey and how we
16 can shorten it, but that's at the very, very
17 beginning stages.

18 MS. JOHNSON: Well, it sounds like
19 there are parents that want to participate that
20 are not given the opportunity to, and then we
21 have -- like we're saying we're not getting enough
22 response. So---

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: I wondered how they
24 decided like what that sample size has to be
25 because I'm thinking, well, if you're not

1 getting---

2 MS. GRANT: It's a statistical
3 formula---

4 MS. HUTCHINSON: And the five largest
5 districts, they always get included---

6 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah, yeah.

7 MS. HUTCHINSON: ---and then a
8 percent from the five largest districts, and then
9 all the other districts on our on a five-year
10 rotation. Like we just got sampled last year, so
11 I can put it on my calendar. It's going to be
12 four years. And based on our total child count,
13 they take a percentage of OHI, a percentage of
14 SLD, and like I said, like---

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: And they send you
16 like specific names for it to go home?

17 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's in an envelope
18 that is sealed, and "Dear Virginia Moorehead,
19 parent of, you know, Child Moorehead --" or
20 Moorefield. I'm sorry.

21 MS. GRANT: And we can't change that
22 to somebody else.

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: Right. Because I
24 was wondering how that got done because I was
25 thinking, okay, well, like if---

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: You know some of
2 those, when you put them in the bags, you're
3 like---

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah, that's not
5 going anywhere.

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: But, yeah, you can't
7 change the names and say I know this one won't
8 come back.

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: Because I wondered
10 if like -- you know, if that could be handed to a
11 parent in an IEP meeting with at least like a
12 signature to decline if they didn't want to do it
13 so that we would at least know, okay, we don't
14 have the information because the parent decided,
15 you know, chose not to participate and not because
16 the parent had no idea that they could.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think it's
18 definitely an area we can discuss later, and I'm
19 sure--- There goes the chair. Well, you're the
20 co-chair or vice chair.

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: I just think that
22 I'd echo what Christy said, that we're asked all
23 the time how can we get that rate to improve. So
24 if we had some ideas, I am certain they would be
25 open-minded to it.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm sure a 20- or
2 30-minute brainstorming session along here for
3 Nancy would probably be very beneficial. One
4 thing that I had a concern with, looking at the
5 graduation rate, is 70 percent, and I think that's
6 pretty great. You know, I think it's pretty good.
7 It's not great, but it's -- you know, but if you
8 look at the proficiency rates---

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah. How that's
10 that possible?

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. I mean,
12 seriously, that's---

13 MS. MOOREFIELD: And that's one of my
14 issues too, is that in North Carolina a kid has to
15 fail before they're allowed to be -- to repeat a
16 grade. So if that kid has barely -- maybe had a
17 day on a multiple-choice assessment -- has met
18 that number, then they get pushed on without the
19 proficiency needed to continue on, which just puts
20 them further and further and further and further
21 behind, which makes them hate school more and more
22 and more, which takes their motivation down more
23 and more and more, and there's nothing a parent
24 can do about it.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. I've often

1 wondered because I mean I know that with my
2 daughter -- you know, with IDEA and the severity
3 of her disability, there's no way she's going to
4 grade out of special education. Would having
5 retained her in second grade have helped her learn
6 those crucial, critical reading skills or first
7 grade---

8 MS. MOOREFIELD: And you can't even
9 do that.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. And you
11 can't even do that at that age level.

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: You can't do it.
13 That's why we -- like I didn't even start my
14 seven-year-old until -- I started him a year late
15 because I knew that if I started him on time and
16 he was not able to keep up with proficiency -- and
17 I kind of had my suspicions that he might not -- I
18 would not be able, you know, as his mother, to
19 make that decision to hold him back to get a
20 firmer foundation.

21 So that's one of our fundamental,
22 across-the-board, not-just-EC issues in North
23 Carolina, is that we pass kids along just because
24 they meet a certain number and not because they
25 actually have proficiency to be successful at the

1 next level, and that I think also probably feeds
2 into the mental health issue.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: And I was also
4 looking at -- let's see for this one -- maybe some
5 modest improvements or increases in like 5a
6 because it seems like we're getting very close --
7 we've actually passed that target. So let's raise
8 the target a little bit. Let's see if we can't
9 hit 68 percent or 70 percent.

10 MS. MOOREFIELD: Which one was that?
11 I'm sorry.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: 5a, educational
13 environments. Because we want our kids to be as
14 much as possible in the full inclusive
15 environment.

16 MS. MOOREFIELD: This is another one
17 that I just wanted opinions from people who know
18 more than me. So I just -- my concern with all
19 three of these -- a, b, and c -- is that I don't
20 want kids to be put into an inappropriate
21 placement just for the sake of a number.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's true too.

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: You know, I kind of
24 question why we measure some of this stuff or why
25 we don't have ranges on some of it.

1 MS. GRANT: Because the federal
2 government tells us we have to.

3 MS. MOOREFIELD: Oh, well, that's a
4 great reason, then, because they know what they're
5 doing there.

6 MS. GRANT: I will tell you with
7 ECATS, with the new IEPs, they actually
8 intentionally took off regular, resource,
9 separate. So the regular, resource, separate
10 doesn't drive the placement. So you're looking at
11 the total -- how much time does this child need
12 for this reading goal or for this math goal. So I
13 don't know if you've had your IEP meeting or seen
14 the new ECATS stuff.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: Huh-uh, not yet.

16 MS. GRANT: But they did
17 intentionally take that off of the -- that's only
18 a federally reported thing, so they took it off
19 the state form so that your discussion is centered
20 not around we can't -- we can't give them that
21 much time because then they'll be separate and
22 they'll have to go into Extended Content
23 Standards. You know what I'm saying?

24 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yes.

25 MS. GRANT: So it's not driving the

1 type of class.

2 MS. MOOREFIELD: Because I was not
3 allowed to put my child in a regular education
4 classroom because then he would lose his therapy
5 services.

6 MS. GRANT: Yeah. So all of that's
7 off the IEP now for a reason, right.

8 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. All right.
9 That was my only concern with the whole of 5.

10 MS. HUTCHINSON: Like it just
11 calculates automatically. You can see it -- as
12 the director, you can see the percent.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: So I mean I was
14 just sharing that I was looking at maybe a modest
15 increase in the 5a to 70 or 68 percent. Just
16 raise it slightly. Because we're at 67.4.
17 Since we have already beat that, so raising it a
18 little bit might not be a bad thing.

19 I was also looking at the 7's, with
20 modest increases for them since we're right at or
21 have exceeded the targets as well. Those are the
22 preschool outcomes. And I was wondering if we
23 could possibly get -- I had written down that I
24 had a concern. What was it?

25 MS. MOOREFIELD: Did I hear her say

1 that in the next year or two the preschool --
2 those preschool indicators will be mixed in with
3 the K-12?

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: The five-year-olds.
5 The five-year-olds.

6 MS. MOOREFIELD: Just the
7 five-year-olds.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: If you have a
9 five-year-old in kindergarten, they're going to be
10 with the kindergarten to 12. If you have a
11 five-year-old in preschool, they're going to be
12 with preschool.

13 MS. MOOREFIELD: Oh, okay. But we're
14 still looking at pre-K and K-12 separate?

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. But I was
16 also wanting to look at, you know, as a possible
17 future meeting, since I'm going to be leaving as
18 chair, what's the -- not the proficiency rate --
19 preschool programming, what are the challenges of
20 providing a more inclusive environment for our
21 pre-K students. Because there's never going to be
22 an opportunity for our most severe students to be
23 close to the same level as their nondisabled peers
24 than preschool and kindergarten. There's never
25 going to be a more level playing field than

1 preschool and kindergarten ever.

2 MS. MOOREFIELD: Right. And if we
3 can get those early intervention things set up in
4 preschool for some of these kids, they may not
5 ever enter into the EC K-12.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: They might still
7 need a little bit of support through speech
8 therapy or something like that, but we can---

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: It's going to be way
10 more cost-effective to nip some of these
11 disorders -- you know, like the ladies were
12 talking about with the dyslexia -- I mean I'm sure
13 that three years old might be -- you know, but if
14 we could, you know, identify and put our focus in
15 these kids when they're little, they might not
16 need as many resources as they go through.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. So barriers
18 to more inclusive environments in the preschool
19 level.

20 MS. GRANT: And what is the State
21 doing about those to help that. And I think, when
22 you sit here and you look at all this and you hear
23 about our kids being out in regular classes more
24 and more inclusive environments, I get it. We
25 have a group -- there's a National Inclusion

1 Conference. It's actually here in North Carolina
2 every year, and that is a huge push.

3 And we have tried that and we are
4 doing it, but we have taken -- had to take a lot
5 of time to work with the regular ed teachers. We
6 spent just years preparing them for, you know,
7 what is it going to be like, what does a child
8 with autism -- what are the characteristic even of
9 a child with autism, and now we're there, and
10 we're still facing some challenges.

11 But I just think this is not
12 something -- even with the proficiency, when you
13 look at the percentage of our students as a state
14 that are out in regular ed, this is not an EC
15 thing that EC is going to fix by themselves
16 because a lot of the schools -- it's a tier one
17 core instructional issue.

18 And I know I'm on record right now,
19 but I do not ever allow my teachers to use that as
20 an excuse. "Well, my kids aren't mastering the
21 standards because of what the regular ed teachers
22 are doing."

23 And I say, "Don't stop. What are we
24 doing to help them provide some supports?" But we
25 can talk about it all we want in this environment,

1 but until we get regular ed to the table to talk
2 about what are you doing and how are you pushing
3 out MTSS and how are you rolling out tiered
4 instruction and the supports that need to be put
5 in place and how you building in universal design
6 for learning within your standards and your
7 curriculum guides and maps that go out, we're not
8 going to see a whole change wholesale over the
9 state because we can't fix it ourselves.

10 MS. HUTCHINSON: That's over 80
11 percent of our kids.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have a question.
13 Do we have a regular education teacher on this
14 Council?

15 MS. DANIELS-HALL: We used to.

16 MS. HUTCHINSON: He's the regular ed
17 administrator.

18 MS. GRANT: You tell me. I mean, do
19 you agree with that? Do you see anything
20 different than what I said?

21 MR. BAKER: What you said, you're
22 exactly right, 100 percent.

23 MS. COFFEY: Christy, I'm looking
24 behind you while you're saying that. It says,
25 "Whole school, whole community, whole child." It

1 doesn't say all that separate.

2 MR. BAKER: It's got to be everybody.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I wonder if we
4 should see if we can't get a person that is -- you
5 know, you're a regular ed administrator, but a
6 person that's in the classroom. I know you're a
7 mom, but you're also a regular ed -- it's kind of
8 hard to wear two hats, don't you think?

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: I've got three or
10 four going on over here. I've got multiple
11 personalities to go with them too.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: You wear too many
13 hats just like the rest of us. But that might be
14 something we want to look at, is see if we can't
15 get a regular education teacher as a teacher
16 position. And we love your input as a teacher as
17 well, but just -- because when you cycle off,
18 who's going to replace you?

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: Well, so far they
20 haven't wanted to find anybody, so that's why I
21 cycled back on. I think if I just -- you know,
22 keep low, they'll just keep sending off those
23 letters.

24 MS. GRANT: Indicator 1, then, did we
25 talk about maintaining that 80 percent? Because

1 it seems to me that we're headed there already.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's what I was
3 thinking because I mean jumping ten percent in one
4 year, wow, that would be awesome, but if we're not
5 having the proficiency to match the graduation
6 rate -- yeah, that's what I was thinking is
7 maintaining 1. The same way with 2 and 3.

8 4a, I thought maybe we could decrease
9 that to one percent, but I'll let the special
10 ed -- you administrators, you know the districts
11 and stuff like that and how that would impact.

12 MS. HUTCHINSON: You're talking about
13 4a?

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: 4a, yeah. That's
15 the suspension and long-term expulsion.

16 MS. HUTCHINSON: So you're saying
17 decrease that?

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: To one percent.

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: Is that what we
20 talked about a couple of years ago with the
21 disproportionality and all the math I didn't
22 understand?

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yes.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. Because
25 right now it's at .34 percent because there's just

1 one district.

2 MS. GRANT: Well, they changed the
3 way they -- they changed the way they did the
4 calculations this year. So you may see it next
5 year---

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Be different.

7 MS. GRANT: ---jump up and be
8 different because of the way the calculations were
9 changed.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. So we might
11 want to maintain that one and find out next year
12 what we want to do with that for the seven-year or
13 six-year period.

14 5a, educational environments. I had
15 suggested up to 68 or 70 percent. Is there any
16 more discussion around that?

17 MR. BAKER: That's fine.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: 5b, 5c, 6a, and 6b,
19 I was thinking along the lines of maintaining. Is
20 there any discussion around those?

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: Can you say those
22 numbers again real quick?

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: 5b, 5c, 6a, and 6b.

24 MS. HUTCHINSON: Maintain?

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, I was

1 thinking maintain those.

2 MS. GRANT: Let me ask you this and
3 maybe, Christy, you may can help me understand
4 this because I get so confused.

5 MS. HUTCHINSON: Because it's
6 supposed to go down.

7 MS. GRANT: For 5b -- 5b, we're
8 already at 13.96. So we're below what our target
9 is. So instead of 15 percent, we may want to look
10 at decreasing that to 13 percent or 14 percent.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: But for 5b, let's
12 take a look at that. That's for the regular ed
13 less than 40 percent of the time.

14 MS. HUTCHINSON: You want that to go
15 down.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, that's right.
17 So increase a and decrease b. Okay. I can see
18 doing that.

19 MS. GRANT: So it would be decreasing
20 to the target---

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: To 13.5.

22 MS. GRANT: ---to 13 percent or 13.5
23 or 13, either one.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

25 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. So explain---

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: What we're saying is
2 we want less kids in a more restrictive
3 environment. Does that make sense?

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah.

5 MS. GRANT: You have to think about
6 it backwards. I always get confused with that
7 one.

8 MS. COFFEY: [Inaudible] change
9 something about the baseline? One of the first
10 rules was about the baseline.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Certain ones.

12 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's below the
13 baseline, not because it's worse. It's below the
14 baseline because it's better. So it's like saying
15 we want a higher percentage of our kids in a less
16 restrictive environment, and we are making the
17 window of kids that are in a very restrictive
18 environment smaller. So the baseline is at 16
19 percent, and we're saying oh, no, we're going to
20 do better.

21 MS. MOOREFIELD: But we don't want
22 kids kicked out of a placement that they need to
23 be in, in order to satisfy---

24 MS. HUTCHINSON: Those are all IEP
25 team decisions.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: But, as she just
2 said, they've taken out the -- those things --
3 you're not looking at that when you're doing your
4 IEP.

5 MS. MOOREFIELD: So why are we
6 measuring that?

7 MS. GRANT: The federal government.
8 That's a requirement from the federal
9 government -- regular, resource, separate.

10 MS. MOOREFIELD: So, in theory, these
11 numbers have absolutely nothing to do with where a
12 child is determined to be placed as the best place
13 for them?

14 MS. HUTCHINSON: No. It's an outcome
15 of the decision of the IEP team. So if we said
16 this kid needs four hours of speech a week and two
17 hours of OT and eight hours of--- I don't even
18 know---

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: I was going to say,
20 can you come work with my child?

21 MS. GRANT: You better take that
22 back, Christy.

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: No, I'm just making
24 up numbers. ---then we decided that's what it's
25 going to take to get those goals that we decided

1 are appropriate goals, and then on backside, we
2 can see the report that says that means the child
3 is in this setting. And the only reason those
4 settings exist of pockets is because of federal
5 reporting requirements.

6 MS. MOOREFIELD: So it's not likely
7 that a kid is -- you know, that an LEA is going
8 to say, "Oh, we've got too many kids in
9 self-contained classrooms. Let's kick some of
10 them out"?

11 MS. HUTCHINSON: It should never
12 change an IEP team's decision.

13 MS. GRANT: The only time that would
14 be the case is if you have over one percent tested
15 on the Extended Content Standards, Extend 1, the
16 new alternate assessment. That's the only time
17 that that becomes an issue.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: And 6a -- the 6's
19 are the preschool environments. The 7's are the
20 preschool outcomes. And I was thinking modest
21 increases in those since our preschoolers seem to
22 be doing fantastic.

23 MS. HUTCHINSON: 5c---

24 MS. MOOREFIELD: I was going to say I
25 think we can always do better.

1 MS. HUTCHINSON: Can we go back to
2 5c?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: 5c? Yes.

4 MS. HUTCHINSON: 5c is the same exact
5 situation that Christy just brought up as to 5b.
6 We have exceeded our expectation. Two was our
7 goal, and we're down to 1.7 in that very
8 restrictive environment. So I think that we
9 should consider looking at like, at the very
10 least, [inaudible].

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: That is actually
12 one I'd rather see across the board because I know
13 not every county has a separate facility because
14 these are -- when they say "separate," we're not
15 talking about a self-contained classroom, if I'm
16 correct; we're talking about a separate school.

17 MS. HUTCHINSON: It depends on the
18 percent of time in special education.

19 MS. MOOREFIELD: Because I know that
20 like they are---

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: It doesn't mean a
22 building or a program; it means the amount of time
23 in special education services.

24 MS. MOOREFIELD: But I know that for
25 it to be considered a self-contained classroom,

1 there have to be architectural -- there are
2 architectural requirements for that as well.
3 Because if it's a self-contained classroom, it has
4 to be connected, it has to have its own bathroom,
5 it has to have its own---

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: This has nothing to
7 do with that. This has to do with how much time
8 that child's getting special education.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: No. Because 5b is
10 already less than 40 percent.

11 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. So that would
12 be anything less than. So even if they had never
13 spent time in a regular class, that's where that
14 would be.

15 MS. HUTCHINSON: Since it's less than
16 20 percent -- I think 5c is less than 20 percent
17 of their day is spent in the regular education
18 classroom. Isn't separate less than 20 percent?

19 MS. GRANT: This is the one I always
20 get confused on.

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: Because I think
22 regular is 80 percent or more and then resource is
23 60 and then 40 and then 20. It goes by increments
24 of 20.

25 MS. GRANT: Something makes me think

1 you're [inaudible] because that separate number is
2 being captured in 6a -- no, not 6a -- 5b.

3 MS. HUTCHINSON: The number of
4 students with IEPs served in a separate school,
5 residential facilities, or homebound placement.
6 You're exactly right.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: So I would hesitate
8 to do that one simply because [inaudible] certain
9 programs and facilities.

10 MS. GRANT: You're right.

11 MS. HUTCHINSON: So the glitchy thing
12 about this is this target says ages six through
13 21, and our new data is going to include those
14 five-year-olds. So that will just have to change
15 the language.

16 MS. MOOREFIELD: So that one is like
17 a completely separately thing?

18 MS. GRANT: You're thinking maintain?

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Maintaining that
20 one because that's like that school that -- I
21 don't know if you visited a couple of years ago
22 when we sent to the Haynes-Inman School down in --
23 outside of Greensboro where Vicki taught.

24 MS. GRANT: No. I know where you're
25 talking about, though.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, that kind of
2 school. I mean it's part of the school district
3 of the county, but it's---

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: I see what you're
5 saying.

6 MS. GRANT: No, I think you're right.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think we'd rather
8 maintain that one.

9 MS. HUTCHINSON: I got you. Okay.
10 Sorry.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's okay. Or
12 programs like your DHHS programs probably have
13 some like that as well. So, yeah, there's several
14 of them.

15 MS. MOOREFIELD: A random question.
16 Never mind. No, never mind.

17 MS. GRANT: So we've already met 7a,
18 right?

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Uh-huh. 7a, A,
20 yeah.

21 MS. GRANT: And 7b.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: 7a, B; 7b, yeah.

23 MS. GRANT: And c. That's where she
24 said she's going to be looking -- they're going to
25 now be looking at the trend data to see how --

1 where to move from there, how you go from there by
2 going back and looking the trend data because
3 there was no data prior to that time.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Uh-huh.

5 MS. MOOREFIELD: What were the two --
6 what were the A and B numbers in all three of
7 those?

8 MS. HUTCHINSON: Preschool?

9 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah. In the 7a
10 through c, there's like an A number and a B number
11 in all three of those categories, and I missed
12 what she said those were. Do you see what I'm
13 talking about?

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: I wish we actually
15 had the -- let me see if I can't pull it up.

16 MS. UTZ: I was just looking through
17 her presentation, but I don't see anything that
18 differentiates what the A is and what the B is.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

20 MS. MOOREFIELD: Well, since the A is
21 higher, I say we go with that one.

22 MS. COFFEY: Is this the area,
23 though, where the five-year-olds are going to
24 switch out, and could that affect the numbers?

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: That might be part

1 of it. I can't remember the---

2 MS. GRANT: No. This is just
3 preschool outcomes. So we -- when a child comes
4 in, we do an entry COSF, Child Outcome Summary
5 Form, and then when they leave us, we do an exit.
6 So it doesn't matter if it's -- when they leave
7 preschool, then they're going to have an exit
8 COSF.

9 MS. COFFEY: Okay. I just wanted to
10 make sure that wasn't going to change the
11 percentages next year.

12 (Pause.)

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's see. Number
14 8 was parent involvement.

15 MS. HUTCHINSON: I have Nancy's cell
16 phone. Do you want me to see if I can shoot her a
17 text and ask the question?

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, that would be
19 good.

20 MS. GRANT: That would be great.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just what were the
22 A's and the B's. Parent involvement, I had said
23 that I'd keep that as maintain with it penciled in
24 that we're going to discuss better ways of doing
25 it next year or in the future.

1 14a, postschool or post-high school
2 outcomes, higher education maintain. For 14b, I
3 was thinking to increase or maintain since we're
4 so close to hitting that goal. That's the higher
5 education or competitively employed. And for 14c,
6 I was thinking [inaudible] and match it to the
7 desired graduation rate because, you know, we
8 would like for all of our kids that graduate high
9 school -- that have the capability to graduate
10 high school to be able to be employed.

11 MR. BAKER: Be employed, absolutely.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: ---in some form or
13 fashion.

14 MS. MOOREFIELD: And do we know if
15 like maybe in 14c -- does that include kids who
16 might -- like they may not have a physical ability
17 to do like work, work, but they might be involved
18 in community programs where they're, you know,
19 contributing something?

20 MS. HUTCHINSON: So that is defined
21 by the federal guidelines what's considered
22 competitive work.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, 14c is also
24 other employment.

25 MS. GRANT: 14c is, yeah, the other

1 employment.

2 MS. MOOREFIELD: But like if they're
3 not like getting paid for it but they're involved
4 in like a community organization?

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. Does it
6 include volunteer work and stuff like that? So I
7 think as a minimum, our---

8 MS. HUTCHINSON: They define that for
9 us. We can't change that.

10 MS. GRANT: I wrote down not
11 competitive employment. So that could be a VR
12 training program, self-employed, or---

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: They sell
14 Tupperware. Hey, no laughing at that. I sold
15 Tupperware.

16 MS. MOOREFIELD: I was going to say,
17 hey, if you can sell it without buying it all.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's the problem.
19 But, yeah, I was thinking of matching that one
20 with the graduation rate of 80 percent because
21 we'd like for all of our kids that graduate with a
22 diploma to be able to be gainfully employed or
23 going for further education, whether you have to
24 have special education or not.

25 MS. MOOREFIELD: How do we match that

1 with the 80 percent?

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: What do you mean?

3 MS. MOOREFIELD: So like if our
4 graduation goal is to have all kids with the EC
5 Program -- at least 80 percent of them graduating,
6 how do we -- how do we break that over those three
7 categories, or does it matter?

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: The only one
9 [inaudible] is that last one that's 80 percent.
10 If 14a goes to 43 percent, that 43 percent still
11 feeds into your 80 percent. Do you see what I'm
12 saying or trying to? So, ultimately, no real care
13 of where they go, but they have something that
14 they're doing postgraduation. I'd love for it to
15 be 100 percent, for every one of our kids to be
16 something, but---

17 MS. GRANT: Well, I agree, but the
18 only thing you need to remember is a lot of these
19 kids you can get ahold of, right, so you have 20
20 that graduated. I may can get up with ten or 15,
21 and that's a good number. Do you know what I'm
22 saying?

23 MS. MOOREFIELD: Yeah. Yeah.

24 MS. GRANT: So that's why I'm leery.
25 I mean I would love to put 100, but some of this

1 is just that you can't get 100 percent of your
2 kids to see where they fall within these.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right, yeah, yeah.

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: But 14c includes
5 both a and b, right?

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: So it's based off
7 of the total number that graduated or total number
8 you're able to contact?

9 MS. GRANT: It goes with that
10 cohort -- the graduation cohort, and if you have
11 100 graduates but you can only get ahold of 50, I
12 mean you don't have data -- you only have 50
13 percent of your data. That's the frustrating part
14 with not having -- people change their numbers a
15 lot. They move. That's stuff beyond the control
16 of---

17 MS. MOOREFIELD: Right. And if they
18 had a bad experience at their school, they're not
19 going to---

20 MS. HUTCHINSON: Respond.

21 MS. MOOREFIELD: ---they're not going
22 to want to help out.

23 MS. DANIELS-HALL: So, Leanna, you
24 are suggesting raising 14c---

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: 14c to 80 percent.

1 MS. DANIELS-HALL: ---to match 80
2 percent with our graduation rate?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

4 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Okay. And we're
5 already at 77.7 percent.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: I know. I didn't
7 think that was such a big jump for that, if you
8 know what I mean.

9 MR. BAKER: I agree. I think that's
10 fine personally.

11 MS. HUTCHINSON: I think it is too.

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: So we want to
13 maintain a and b and then raise c?

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Uh-huh. That was
15 my recommendation. 15, 16, and 17, I have
16 maintain, but I did have a concern that the four-
17 and five-year cohort rates have dropped.
18 Student--- Oh, I just wrote a note -- never
19 mind -- about what she had said that, you know,
20 the cohorts have dropped but the---

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: But overall it's
22 getting better.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. We're still
24 graduating more students, but we just have a lower
25 percentage because we have a higher student body.

1 MS. GRANT: I have the preschool
2 thing now. Do you want me to read that?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

4 MS. GRANT: So A is regular early
5 childhood program and receiving the majority of
6 special ed and related services in regular ed, and
7 B, it's broken out by separate special ed class,
8 separate school, or residential facility, it looks
9 like to me. But I would like to confirm that with
10 Nancy. You know what I'm saying?

11 MS. MOOREFIELD: So the A number, we
12 think is for kids who have potential disabilities
13 but who are attending regular programs and B---

14 MS. GRANT: No, this doesn't say
15 that. Give that one to Nancy because this doesn't
16 even say it. I'm sorry. That was my fault. That
17 was 6. You can't access the State Plan online
18 right now through the website.

19 So we're good with everything else,
20 then, right?

21 MS. HUTCHINSON: And I'm happy to
22 email you, Cynthia or Leanna, whomever has the
23 communication with everybody and see whatever she
24 says and then I can send it out to you---

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

1 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Okay.

2 MS. HUTCHINSON: ---electronically
3 and just see what the answer is.

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: Also, when students
5 are about to exit out, so when they're about to
6 graduate, are they told that "Hey, we want to
7 follow up with you in a year. We want to know
8 where you are"? Like are they -- do they expect
9 that follow-up, or are they just being hit with a
10 cold call? Do we know?

11 MS. GRANT: I'm sorry. Do what?

12 MS. MOOREFIELD: So like when a kid
13 is about to graduate, are they told that, you
14 know, "We want to follow up with you. We want to
15 see how you're doing at least for this first
16 year," so that they know to kind of expect that
17 follow-up and maybe participate more in telling us
18 where they are, or are they just like cold-called?

19 MS. GRANT: We started doing that a
20 couple of years ago, so we got like a couple of
21 numbers from them that were current like aunts,
22 uncles, that kind of stuff. We didn't see a real
23 difference. Where we've seen the biggest
24 difference is, we've started having schools call
25 their own, and normally, there's brothers or

1 sisters or cousins or people who have been
2 embedded in that school, right, that know how to
3 contact them, and they're able to find them.

4 MS. MOOREFIELD: But like are they
5 told---

6 MS. GRANT: We tell them.

7 MS. MOOREFIELD: ---that somebody is
8 going to?

9 MS. GRANT: We tell them that, yes.

10 MS. MOOREFIELD: Okay. That's like a
11 district thing?

12 MS. GRANT: Yes. When we do their
13 exit meeting.

14 MS. HUTCHINSON: It's the difference
15 between those students that met the outcomes and
16 the students that didn't meet the outcomes, so
17 kind of like going back [inaudible]. I wouldn't
18 mind getting her like answer, though, but I think
19 that you're onto the right answer. She's got the
20 report from those that have a COSF that's met it
21 and COSF that didn't meet it.

22 And so obviously those kids in B are
23 the ones that did not meet their expected learning
24 trajectories and were not ready to enter with
25 [inaudible] peers in the regular environment.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: That doesn't make
2 it 100 percent, though. It's higher than 100
3 percent if you add A and B together. If A is how
4 many met it and B is how many didn't meet it,
5 adding them together should be 100 percent.

6 MS. HUTCHINSON: And it's not even
7 super, super close like---

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: 99.9 or 102 or
9 anything.

10 MS. GRANT: Let's just wait to hear
11 from her on that.

12 MS. HUTCHINSON: Yeah. I don't want
13 to make a decision based on that information.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for that.
15 We got that done, so we're good to go there. It's
16 3:00.

17 So you're the new chair. We're going
18 to email you all the -- I'm going to email you
19 what I have for the annual report. I didn't get a
20 chance to enter in the stuff from the last meeting
21 as far as what the different subcommittees did,
22 but I think they had already done the completed
23 activities for the year. But I'll email that to
24 you---

25 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: ---probably like at
2 11:00 tonight when I get to my -- hopefully, I'll
3 have my computer because I've got to take it in
4 because the battery is wonky on it. If not, it's
5 going to be -- I'll get it to you as soon as I
6 can.

7 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Thank you. So do
8 we need a motion to adjourn?

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Any other concerns
10 or questions before we adjourn for the day?

11 **(No audible response.)**

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for you
13 active participation. It was a very good, very
14 productive meeting, I think. What do you think?

15 MS. DANIELS-HALL: Yes, absolutely.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. All right.
17 Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

18 MS. GRANT: I make a motion to
19 adjourn.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Do I hear a
21 second?

22 MR. BAKER: I second.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: All in favor?

24 **(All council members responded**
25 **affirmatively.)**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Have a merry
Christmas, everyone. It's been a pleasure serving
you these past five years.

(At 3:00 p.m., the proceeding
adjourned.)

- - - - -

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, REBECCA P. SCOTT, State-Certified
Verbatim Reporter, do hereby certify:

That said proceeding was reported by
me and the foregoing pages, numbered 4 through
229, are a true record of the proceeding to the
best of my knowledge and belief;

That I am neither related to nor
employed by any of the parties or counsel employed
by the parties hereto, nor interested directly or
indirectly in the matter in controversy, and am
not financially or otherwise interested in the
outcome of the action.

Certified this 13th day of January,
2020.



Rebecca P. Scott