COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Via Webex
June 9, 2021
9:31 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF QUARTERLY MEETING

The quarterly meeting of the Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children was held on the 9th day of June, 2021, via Webex, commencing at 9:31 a.m.

APPEARANCES

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cynthia Daniels-Hall, Chairperson

Sara Bigley
Diane Coffey
Aimee Combs
Elizabeth DeBiasi
Jennifer Grady
Christy Grant
Kristen Hodges
Virginia Moorefield
Lisa Phillips
Kenya Pope
Matthew Potter
Kimaree Sanders

STAFF:

Kelley Blas
Amanda Byrd
Lauren Holahan
Matt Hoskins
Danyelle Sanders
Sherry Thomas
Alexis Utz

COURT REPORTER:

Rebecca P. Scott

autism spectrum and I'm a parent.

MS. UTZ: All right.

23

24

25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Shanna?

	Quarterly Meeting June 9, 2021 Page 8
1	MS. UTZ: I don't see her name. I
2	don't see Leanna's name.
3	THE CHAIRPERSON: Diane would be
4	next.
5	MS. UTZ: Yeah.
6	THE CHAIRPERSON: Diane?
7	MS. UTZ: She's here.
8	THE CHAIRPERSON: She may be having
9	connection issues. Okay. Next person?
10	MS. UTZ: Leanna. I don't see
11	Leanna's name.
12	THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And Abby's
13	not here.
14	MS. UTZ: Kristen is here.
15	MS. HODGES: Good morning. This is
16	Kristen Hodges. It's good to speak with you. I
17	am a parent of three children. One has an IEP for
18	academic needs, one has an IEP for speech, and one
19	has a 504 plan.
20	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Good
21	morning.
22	MS. UTZ: I don't see Jennifer.
23	Christy Grant is here.
24	MS. GRANT: Yes. Good morning. My
25	name is Christy Grant. I am the Executive

But I'm also a parent, but my kids are all old. I've got three adult children. One is a special [inaudible] on the autism spectrum, and one is just finishing up at UNC Charlotte, and I'm also a grandmom to three little girls.

22

23

24

25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Any abstentions? (No audible response.) THE CHAIRPERSON: Anyone opposed? (No audible response.) THE CHAIRPERSON: And all in favor? (Multiple council members responded aye.) MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again. MS. UTZ: All right.		Quarterly Meeting June 9, 2021 Page 13
THE CHAIRPERSON: Anyone opposed? (No audible response.) THE CHAIRPERSON: And all in favor? (Multiple council members responded aye.) MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	1	THE CHAIRPERSON: Any abstentions?
THE CHAIRPERSON: And all in favor? (Multiple council members responded aye.) MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	2	(No audible response.)
THE CHAIRPERSON: And all in favor? (Multiple council members responded aye.) MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	3	THE CHAIRPERSON: Anyone opposed?
(Multiple council members responded aye.) MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	4	(No audible response.)
MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	5	THE CHAIRPERSON: And all in favor?
MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	6	(Multiple council members responded
9 a break. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the vrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	7	aye.)
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	8	MS. UTZ: I'll edit that later during
MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	9	a break.
wrong thing, I think. THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	10	THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	11	MS. UTZ: Oh, I just put that in the
agenda, yeah. MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	12	wrong thing, I think.
MS. UTZ: All right. THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	13	THE CHAIRPERSON: That was the
THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	14	agenda, yeah.
review the agenda for today? MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	15	MS. UTZ: All right.
MS. GRANT: Yes. THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	16	THE CHAIRPERSON: So did everybody
THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	17	review the agenda for today?
motion to approve the agenda? MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	18	MS. GRANT: Yes.
MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	19	THE CHAIRPERSON: So can we get a
approve the agenda. THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	20	motion to approve the agenda?
THE CHAIRPERSON: Second? MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	21	MS. GRANT: Yes. I make a motion to
MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.	22	approve the agenda.
	23	THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?
MS. UTZ: All right.	24	MS. COFFEY: I'll second again.
	25	MS. UTZ: All right.

And with me, I have the amazing Kelley Blas. Kelley, would you like to introduce yourself?

MS. BLAS: Well, that was a good introduction, Lauren. My name is Kelley Blas. I am the IDEA Part B Data Manager and currently fulfilling the role of the SPP, or State Performance Plan, coordinator. So I am grateful to be here with you guys today. Thank you.

on what I think is the request and just so we don't like jump right into telling you all the things that we're really enthusiastic about, my sense is that you-all are interested in sort of a summary of the work that's been done to date as we develop our new State Performance Plan and give you an overview of what our stakeholders have said back to us so far. Is that about right, Cynthia?

MS. HOLAHAN: Okay. Well, I just want to say if at any point while we're talking, sharing, if there are questions, comments, concerns, I am so happy to be interrupted, corrected, just jump right in.

Am I able to share my screen, Alexis?

THE CHAIRPERSON: That is correct.

conversation and I was on mute. You should be

able to now, Lauren.

MS. HOLAHAN: Okay. I'm up at share and it doesn't--- Oh, now I'm a presenter. Let me try again. Okay. Let's try this. Can you see a letter there?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS. HOLAHAN: Okay. So this is what is linked in the agenda, and I just want to -this will kind of take us through the work that has been done to date and where we're headed and what we're up to, and then I want to give you a tour of the website that we have developed for this process, and then Kelley's going to give us an overview of what we've learned so far.

And so we are embarking on a several-month process to develop a new State Performance

Plan. Nancy Johnson -- the wonderful Nancy

Johnson retired in -- I guess it was -- was it

March or April? But one of the last things she

did was submit our final State Performance Plan of

the last cycle on February 1st of this year.

So that closed out a six-year cycle, and now we have to develop a new State Performance

Plan, and that is -- the work of that is to select 2 baseline data, select new targets, identify improvement strategies, and identify how we're 3 going to -- like what methods we're going to use 5 to measure our progress across those 17 6 performance indicators.

1

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if you are interested in what those are, each one of them, a description is linked there where it says "17 performance indicators."

So as part of that, the way that -we are really excited to have an opportunity to invite a broad range of stakeholders to the work. We have some new requirements from OSEP, the Office of Special Education Programs, in terms of reporting on our stakeholder participation in the development of this new State Performance Plan.

We will be required, for each indicator, to report on specifically the number of parents of students with disabilities, some of the diversity demographics of those parents and their students, and so you'll see some of that data that we've already started collecting.

So one of our objectives in talking with you-all this morning is, one, to make sure

that you know about these meetings, that you're making space for them on your calendar, and that you're sharing the opportunity to participate.

These are open to anyone. They're completely public meetings.

As you can see, we are holding two virtual or online meetings that are two hours long each month. We started in April. One is on a Tuesday morning -- and I'll kind of walk through what we've done since April -- and then another is on a Thursday evening. They're identical meetings. They're duplicates. So you only have to participate in one in order to engage in the process, but we wanted to have a couple of different options to meet different schedules.

And so what we've done since April, you can see over here in this far right column.

We are kind of working through one or two indicators each month giving you a history of our data or our performance over the last six years, talking through any changes that OSEP has made to that indicator, either how it's calculated or what data source is used or any of the business rules.

So we're giving an overview of our old data, any changes, and then giving folks an

opportunity to provide feedback on what we use as our baseline, what targets are we going to choose, and again, what improvement strategies are we going to use to meet those targets and how are we going to measure our progress over time.

So you can see in April we looked at Indicators 1 and 2, and at the same time, we're also conducting a pretty sweeping self-assessment of the EC Division at the Department of Public Instruction, and as we do that self-assessment, we're sharing that information with stakeholders and especially having them say, "Yeah, that sounds like the EC Division we know" or "We really see that differently in terms of your strengths, your needs." And so we're getting feedback on that infrastructure analysis or self-assessment also as we work through this process.

In May, we looked at Indicator 3.

And I'm sorry. I should have said Indicator 1 is graduation -- the graduation rate for students with disabilities, and Indicator 2 is the dropout rate. We moved onto Indicator 3 in May and looked at the reading and math proficiency for students with disabilities, and then we also continued the work on our self-assessment or infrastructure

analysis and got into much more detail with that with stakeholders.

And now in June, next week will be our first June meeting. We're going to actually not be looking at Indicator 4. We're going to be looking at Indicator 14. I need to change that. We've just had a very recent change on that. So we're going to be looking at Indicator 14, which is postschool outcomes, and then Indicator 7, which is preschool outcomes, and then, again, continuing to get feedback on our self-assessment or that infrastructure analysis.

And I'm not going to go too much further through the details of that, but you can see that we've kind of laid out a plan for looking at all of the indicators now through all the way through November. So that when we get to

November, we will have a draft of both our new State Performance Plan and our new State Systemic Improvement Plan, hoping to have a draft -- probably it's going to be more like December -- for all stakeholders, including the Council, to give us feedback on.

So I'm just going to pause there to see if there are any questions.

Identified Measurable Result. That was one reason

25

to use for that student. I think I'm probably not

25

1

answering the question very well.

2

question so you can see it, if that will help.

4

5

3

MS. HOLAHAN: There isn't -- the answer, I guess, is there isn't a way to measure

MS. UTZ: All right.

I sent you the

This is Kelley.

Any other

Ι

6

outcomes once a student is no longer enrolled.

MS. BLAS: Yeah.

7

think it just depends on the indicator that you're

9

8

measuring, and when the student is suspended, of

10

course, expelled, or dropped out, they would be

11

included in the Indicator 2 dropout. However, if

12

they are unable to participate in outcome measures

13

such as assessments or any other indicator that

14

they would be missing due to being suspended or

15

expelled, their information would not be included

16

in the data for that year.

17

questions on sort of this schedule and--- So

18 19

you'll want to hold onto this link because these

MS. HOLAHAN: Right.

20

also include the times, the links to get into the

21

meeting. I also want to say that we have sign

22

language interpreting -- live sign language

23

interpreting that's happening during these

24

meetings, live captioning, and then we are also --

25

and live captioning is offered in English and

Spanish. We are really trying to make this accessible to as many stakeholders as possible.

So the other thing that we're saving about this link is there's also a link to the website where I'm going to take us now. Actually, let me just open it here in your view.

And so what we have here is, again, a description of what the State Performance Plan is, some background information. If you click on one of these -- either one of these tables, it will take you to that invitation letter that I just showed you that has all the meeting links. You can always reach out to me. There's a mailing list if you want to get on the SPP mailing list so that you're getting any updates that we're sending out.

But then I think what's most helpful about this site is there's a link for each month -- like I'll take you to May -- for the PowerPoint presentation that was used, the recording of the meeting that you can listen to in case you didn't get to participate in the live meeting, the feedback tool, then the transcripts from the meetings, and then a description of the improvement strategies that stakeholders select.

Ideas for making this process better? Ideas for

25

So we have compiled all of the

1

stakeholders that responded to our feedback

students -- number of students -- number of

3

survey.

5

4

2

6 tool, and that is how we're tracking our

7 participation. And we gathered demographic data,

8

can see the breakdown of our participants by race

and one of those demographics is race. And so you

feedback and information into a Qualtrics survey

10

9

on this chart, and we would love to see some

11

participants, not just by race, but also

increase in other areas on our -- for all

12 13

especially by parents.

14

MS. HOLAHAN: Yes.

15

MS. BLAS: You can move onto the next

16

the roles, and so these are the participants by

slide. And then I think our next slide shows us

17 18

roles, and as you can see---

19

MS. MOOREFIELD: Excuse me, Kelley.

20

Going back to that previous slide -- this is

21

Ginny Moorefield -- the percentages there of the various race breakdowns, is that the -- like is

23

22

that taken as -- just for example, the American

24

Indian, is that two percent of the responses was

25

American Indian or --- You know what? I just

students with intellectual disabilities and autism. So we had three on each of those. And

24

25

1 2

then again -- and I'll just say, so our total number of parents for our April stakeholder meeting was ten.

And this is the breakdown by the type of school that the students with disabilities were attending, and nine -- nine reported that they were a traditional public school, one in homeschool, and one was not enrolled in school.

MS. HOLAHAN: Yeah. And the reason these numbers are different -- like it says ten here and 11 here -- is that of the 11, one may not have responded to this question.

So I just want to give you a sense of the infrastructure analysis. This is really to help us figure out in a self-assessment and then stakeholder reflection process -- to help us figure out the extent to which our organization, our human resources, our tools, our capacity, our talents -- do we have what we need in order to improve outcomes on all 17 of these indicators, are we working effectively and efficiently as the Exceptional Children Division within the Department of Public Instruction.

And then we are also, at the same time, wanting to ensure that we have all of the

time, wanting to ensure

infrastructure we need to meet our strategic plan
goals. And, of course, we want those two things,
meeting the State Performance Plan indicator
targets and the strategic plan goals, to align.

So this is kind of the process through which we're working through this infrastructure analysis or self-assessment. We did kind of an overview Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats process internally back in March. We got stakeholder feedback on that in April, and then we're doing a much more in-depth and detailed infrastructure analysis really kind of built around the general supervision framework.

And then this fall, we'll look at -based on all these data we've gathered about who
we are and how we're functioning as the Division,
are we equipped to really make progress on our
State Performance Plan and our strategic plan.
And I am not going to go through the details in
this, but there was some -- after we did the
internal Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and
Threats, we came up with some themes for those,
had pretty strong agreement from stakeholders that
those themes were correct, but also got lots of
feedback. And this is probably more of interest

Does it sound better, Lauren?

MS. HOLAHAN: At least on my end, it's still pretty faint.

23

24

25

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

MS. BLAS: Okay. Okay. I am sorry. Let me just try to speak loudly. I want to make sure everybody can hear me. So you can move onto the next slide.

We're looking now at the stakeholder feedback for Indicator 1, and what we did was we shared at least five years of data with our stakeholders and talked to them about setting a baseline, and we had options from OSEP for our baseline. We could either use the most current year, which would have been our '19-20 year, which is also the year that COVID impacted our data the most, or we could go back to the '18-19 year and use data that we felt was more stable because COVID hadn't started yet.

So out of 65 responses, 94 percent of our stakeholders, after reviewing the data, felt like we should use the '18-19 year as our baseline, and you can see that that baseline for '18-19 for Indicator 1 was 77.02, and so that's 77.02 percent of students with disabilities who graduated with a regular high school diploma.

And you can move on, Lauren. And then we talked about setting targets. have to set targets on a six-year cycle, and they

had options to either set the target -- keep the same target as the baseline until the end of the 2 six-year cycle and then bump it up, do an 3 incremental increase every year, or keep baseline 5 targets of 80 percent as we had in the past 6 SPP/APR or use new ESSA targets.

1

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And 57 percent of our stakeholders felt like incremental increases should be used, and 23 percent of our stakeholders felt like 80 percent should be our target for all five years, and it's really a six-year cycle, so we should update that.

Okay. And then for improvement strategies, we gave them several different improvement strategies, and the three that rose to the top were access to CTE courses or career and technical education courses for students with disabilities, using the early warning system in ECATS and Power School and social selfdetermination and life skills instruction. And along with these improvement strategies, we provide our stakeholders with a description and deeper information about what these improvement strategies are within the tool and during our conversations in those meetings.

Okay. You can move onto the measures of progress. And then the final part that we have to report on is how we're going to measure progress towards our targets and towards our goals, and so the three that rose to the top was the graduation calculation based on students with disabilities and their exit data. We would continue to look at the four- and five-year cohort graduation rate that DPI puts out.

That was our previous measure that we were using for Indicator 1, and OSEP has changed that so now we're looking at our students with disabilities exit data, and then number 3 was looking at progress monitoring on course credit accrual. And that was our feedback that we received from stakeholders for Indicator 1.

So I'm going to pause right there before we move into Indicator 2 feedback and just see if there's any questions.

(No audible response.)

MS. BLAS: Okay, Lauren. And so
Indicator 2 is the percentage of students with
IEPs dropping out of high school, and we did the
same kind of method. So we looked at the
baseline. We talked about the difference between

'18-19 and '19-20, and we just saw a significant decrease in '19-20 of students with disabilities dropping out of high school, and we felt like COVID had a big impact on our graduation rate and on our dropout, and we kind of saw the difference when you looked at both of those measures.

So our stakeholders agreed and felt like -- 95 percent of stakeholders felt like '18-19 should be our baseline for Indicator 2, and again, they also felt like an incremental increase for the -- I'm sorry -- decrease. So with Indicator 2, we're looking at decreasing our rate of dropouts, so we start with our baseline, which would be 11.44 percent, and we start decreasing that incrementally and hoping to get to a final target. And I don't have my targets right in front of me to tell you what that final five years is, but it would be linked in the website that Lauren showed you if you wanted to look at those PowerPoints and look at the data itself.

So 86 percent of stakeholders felt like incremental decreases should be used, and ten percent felt like we should just start with 11.44 percent and then just decrease in the final year. And you can see those charts, again, in the

MS. HOLAHAN: Yeah. So these -- when we're thinking about dropout, you know, what the evidence tells us is that if you wait to think about working on dropout until high school, you've waited too late, right?

MS. MOOREFIELD: Well, that was going to be my point, that, you know, if we are only focusing on high school students, then we're not going to get any improvement. Okay. So I'm glad to see that you guys are kind of thinking along the same lines.

MS. HOLAHAN: Yeah. Yeah. We know that certainly late elementary and middle school are -- for these kinds of improvement strategies are really critical both for graduation and dropout. We know that transition from eighth to ninth grade is -- literature tells us that that is a super vulnerable year, right? That transition is incredibly important.

And so making sure that we are setting students with disabilities up for success, that we are attending very carefully to that particular transition so that -- my sense is that these improvement strategies are really going to be critical in middle school especially.

MS. MOOREFIELD: Well, I just want to throw this out there for consideration, that it might be even beneficial to start -- to go ahead and start as soon as -- you know, in kindergarten or whenever the child is identified because if -- you know, when we're talking about especially the parent engagement strategies, you know, if parents start out -- you know, that's when we're engaged because that's when we're young enough to have the energy to be engaged, is when our kids are younger. The older they get, the more tired we get.

And, you know, if they -- if we start at the elementary level, then the parents will be used to being engaged and involved by the time the kid gets to middle and high school, and the parent may even be more likely to demand better and demand more engagement and more improvement strategies, you know, as their child -- you know, as they're used to, you know, as their child goes through the K-12 system.

MS. HOLAHAN: That's really helpful to hear. Thank you.

MS. THOMAS: Lauren?

MS. HOLAHAN: This is Sherry. If I

Quarterly Meeting June 9, 2021 could jump in just a second. One of the things we were very intentional with when we started our State Systemic Improvement Plan five years ago, six years ago was looking at the continuum of transition, so starting with that pre-K student all the way through graduation. So we are right there with you. We've got to start early and often and can't wait till high school to do this. And so much of our work has been built in the last five years around ensuring kids are making good transition and good progress from one transitional time -- so preschool to kindergarten, kindergarten up into regular elementary school, elementary to middle, and middle to high. And so we've worked really hard with districts to keep that focus on what it looks like from the beginning to the graduation piece.

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

What you said just absolutely validated that that is a need we need to continue. So thank you.

MS. BLAS: Thanks, Ginny. And I'll just say that that's exactly the type of conversations that we hope to have in these stakeholder meetings. So it just shows even more why we need you-all on these calls and to just

share your perspective. So thank you, Ginny.

MS. MOOREFIELD: Yes. And I do have your list of meetings, and it is in my plan. Life is just a bit much right now.

MS. BLAS: I understand. So we'll move onto our stakeholder feedback for Indicator 3, which is participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments. And this indicator changed significantly from OSEP, so we had some breakdowns in the way that we're reporting our exams. Again, we did not have any testing -- federally-mandated testing reported for '19-20. So we are looking at the '18-19 school year for our baseline.

And the first indicator is Indicator

3a, and that is participation of students on the

statewide exams, and in the past, our target was

equal to or greater than 95 percent participation,

and as you can see, our stakeholders

overwhelmingly said that they wanted to keep that

target of equal to or greater than 95 percent. We

had a few stakeholders that felt like our

participation should be greater than 95 percent,

and we had some comments regarding COVID, and you

can review those in the slide.

And then we started looking at the 2 breakdown of -- so one of the changes that OSEP made was we -- in the past, we reported our 3 performance of students with disabilities on exams 4 5 from grades 3, 4 -- grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 6 then high school. In the new performance package, 7 we're only reporting on grades 4, 8, and high school. So we did break down the data for those 9 exams.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the other change that they were making is, in the past, we reported the grade level exam and the alternate exam, the NC Extend 1, together in one indicator. So in the new package, those are broken down into separate So for 3b we report on the grade indicators. level -- the grade level test, which is our fourth grade EOG, by itself. So we're not including students who took the alternate exam in this data.

And so the options were to increase the target from the baseline in the final year, increase the target from the baseline incrementally -- and we'll talk a little bit about what the incremental increase looks like -- reuse targets from our previous SPP/APR package, or use targets from the current Every Student Succeeds

Act plan. And, again, a large majority of our stakeholders felt like incremental increases from the baseline would be more beneficial for our students with disabilities in the fourth grade EOG.

And you can move forward to the eighth grade.

MS. HOLAHAN: Yeah. Can I just add, Kelley, that the way we calculated those incremental increases was to ensure that there would be a closing of the gap between proficiency for students with disabilities compared to all students.

MS. BLAS: That's right. That's right. And so Indicator 3d, which you don't see here, we do have to report on the gap between students with disabilities and all students taking the grade level exam. And so we calculated that gap, showed it in our data to our stakeholders, and we used that for our incremental increase.

And so it will not only address -- if we choose to go with our incremental increase, it will not only address 3b, but it would also address what we have to report on for 3d, which is that gap.

And this is eighth grade, and you can

also see that our stakeholders felt like the incremental increase -- and you'll see that throughout the whole presentation -- to high school, they also chose the incremental increase.

And then for improvement strategies, once again, our research-informed practices group worked really hard on choosing improvement strategies for this -- specifically for this indicator, and the top flyers for that were Foundations of Math and Reading Research to Classroom Practice, followed by specially designed instruction with a multi-tiered system of support, and data-based individualization.

And, again, if you want to know more about what these improvement strategies are, go to the website that Lauren provided you, and you go to the May meeting and you can see the attachment that talks specifically about the improvement strategies for this indicator.

And then for our measures of progress, our number one was progress monitoring and then our EOG and EEOC proficiency data, followed by our attendance and discipline early warning system data from Power School and ECATS.

And for Indicator 3c, again, I'll

just remind you that OSEP has broken out our exams to look at grade level exams, and then for Indicator 3c, we're just looking at our alternate achievement exams, and these are the students that are taking the NC Extend test. And, once again, they had the same options for setting different targets, and they chose the incremental increase for fourth grade and eighth grade as well and high school.

And then, Lauren, I don't know if you want to go over the meeting feedback or I can -- I can share on it.

MS. HOLAHAN: Sure. We didn't have this available in April, but it will be -- the final part of their feedback in May and then going forward, just to get some sense of how people who participated in the meetings and/or listened online -- just how they felt in terms of communication prior to the meeting, the organization, the welcome and inclusion spirit of the meeting, if the questions were answered, just a general sense of how their -- what their experience in participating in these meetings was like.

And you can see that there's good

 $\label{eq:theorem} \mbox{THE CHAIRPERSON: So thank you,} \\ \mbox{Lauren and Kelley.}$

24

25

long as you guys can see it. Is that okay?

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

MS. THOMAS: Yes. I think you also linked it, didn't you, into---

MS. UTZ: I did.

MS. THOMAS: Okay. So it's linked in. All right. This shows the four topics that came to us for updates today from the Division are around School Extension Learning Recovery and Enrichment Programs, which was, as you know, the legislative summer enrichment camp. districts are calling it that. The federal increases that we are receiving because of the Americans Recovery Plan dollars that were added to IDEA. Some information on social and emotional And then, finally, we have received our learning. monitoring report as of the 18th of May, and so I'm going to talk a little bit about that.

You can move ahead, Alexis. So this legislation that required parents to have the option to send their children to a summer learning program has criteria that should be met by the student to put them at risk, and all students on an IEP are not at risk. If they are making good progress on their IEP goals, if they are making expected progress related to their grade-level

standards with an IEP, they may or may not be a student that would be a first tier in summer camp. But then it's -- once they've reached the capacity -- once they've reached all students who, in that district, meet the at-risk criteria, if there are other vacancies, then any student can attend whether they meet that at-risk criteria or not.

A couple of things to remember that's been really important for us to clarify for our directors is that this is not an extension of the school year. So this is not a required participation attendance. Therefore, special ed services are not required to be delivered during the summer programs. If students are to receive Extended School Year or Compensatory Education Services, those cannot occur concurrent with that summer program if students are involved in that program.

So if Alexis is in the summer program because she's met that criteria for at risk, she has to get her Extended School Year or her Compensatory Ed, if that is something that is required for her individually, after that schooltime is over, whether it's later in the day

or whether it's in the weeks where this extended summer program is not being offered. But it can't be commingled, in other words.

And I put that statement there.

Students with disabilities are eligible to attend,
but it's not just a requirement that because you
are a student with special needs, a student with
an IEP, that you would automatically be in this
loop for the summer extended learning. There
should be modifications and accommodations
included in that learning if it's appropriate and
if they have been routine for those students,
whether they have a 504 plan or whether they have
an IEP.

And then, additionally, a lot of districts are kind of going above and beyond, and many of them are creating a summer camp experience for students who are on the Extended Content Standards because they recognize that those were the students who were really the hardest sometimes to serve in that virtual setting if it was a district that was extensively in a Plan B or a Plan C delivery of school over the last school year.

You know, we've gotten -- we get a

lot of email, as you know, and an interesting email that I wanted to share is a parent who was actually advocating for her student, who is on the Extended Content Standards, with significant disabilities, to be able to attend virtual public school again next year in a school district's academy because she has been successful. It had been appropriate for her, and so the parent advocated for that virtual learning for the coming school year, and of course, the district has accommodated that.

And all that to say, I believe we are now in a totally new frame of mind of how we look at delivering special education services, how we look at what the least restrictive environment might be for some students, and how we can ensure FAPE in maybe a way that we have not previously thought about doing that. So I think there's going to be some great opportunities moving forward.

I think this summer learning is going to be a great boost to kids, and I think our districts are really working hard to make those additional provisions to provide that additional support engagement. We're trying not to call this

recovery because what it really feels like is more of an enhancement and that additional dose that we talk about in the MTSS world of getting instruction to our kids because of the year they've had with COVID.

Okay, Alexis. So I'm happy to share some really exciting news. We just got this last week. We were notified earlier in the spring that our regular IDEA 611 Grant, which is the schoolage six through -- up to 22 IDEA grant funding for North Carolina, is going to be \$377,384,354, a lot of threes in there. That was our regular allotment, which was an increase from last year, and traditionally, it does go up, you know, a little bit every year. It has over the last several years.

We received the notice that our supplemental award through the Americans Recovery Plan, or ARP as they're calling it, was an additional 81.3 million. So North Carolina's total award for the '21-22 fiscal school year is \$458,700,000 plus. Of note of that is that our -- in our grant, there is always a percentage and it's at about, I think, five percent or so of the total grant award. The formula sets a maximum

amount that we may set aside for administration, and that covers salaries. I mean that is -- that is where we fund our salaries that are under federal -- federal provisions.

So our administration of 6.4, something like that, million will be coming out of the three seventy-seven. There will be no administrative costs coming out of the 81.3 additional million dollars. All of that will go to LEAs. So LEAs are going to get that extra bump of grant funding this year because of that supplemental award.

And then you can go to the next slide, please. And this shows the breakdown from our preschool EC grant, which is IDEA 619 Grant. The same scenario. The regular award was announced earlier in the spring and notification. This is the supplementary additional funding for a total -- and the same rules apply here, no administrative costs will come out of that six million.

So North Carolina has had a nice additional supplemental amount that has been awarded. It's at about 67 million over all, those two funding streams, and so we are very excited to

be able to push that out to our LEAs because we know that additional services are going to continue to be needed. Adjustments are going to need to be made based on how they're providing services, and hopefully, this will be helpful to them.

All right. Next slide, Alexis. And I'm going to turn it over to Matt now.

DR. HOSKINS: Thanks, everyone. Good morning. As always, I appreciate that this is a topic of interest of the Council and am super excited to share.

through the mental health policy, the website that we have, and all the resources that are available there for districts and parents, and we are now at the point where districts are submitting those plans. Those are due on July 1st, and we had a lot of dialogue and conversations with districts and provided a lot of supports to them as they've been in the development of those plans.

So I know that the specific request was social and emotional learning, but I want to talk about social and emotional learning within a broader context, and we'll then go into some

details around specifically what's happening around SEL.

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

One of the first things that I want to talk about is Project AWARE. This is an \$8.8-million grant that we have with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services agency. specifically focused on supporting mental health for students within the context of schools and then with building better partnerships with our community providers for the primary purpose of ensuring that we don't have kids that are slipping through the cracks of the mental health system, knowing that the school is a unique place to be able to provide services, but also the most accessible place that kids can access mental health services, and the stronger partnerships we have and availability there increases their access to that.

We're doing this in a time where we know that just recently there was a report from the CDC that we're seeing about a 31 percent increase in emergency department/emergency room visits for children and adolescents for either suicidal ideation or suicide attempts. And so this is an incredibly important readiness

component that schools are going to have to be facing as we move back into face-to-face instruction, knowing that kids have experienced trauma and will need the supports and identification and referrals when it can't be addressed within the school system.

So with Project AWARE, we feel like we have a really strong protocol and model for doing that across different districts that look differently in terms of geography and demographics, and so we've really been working hard to scale this across the state. They've been the ones that have informed a lot of the mental health policy, a lot of the work that we've done in terms of looking at social and emotional support recommendations during the pandemic and virtual school and then reentry into that.

And then we're also really excited that now that we've had a couple of years of doing this and we're starting to see some of the results that we're really seeing that there's a large number of students that are benefitting from this from a number of different kind of short-term and long-term outcomes. We see that there are a lot of kids that are receiving access to services, but

not only that, we're seeing things that were in our long-term outcomes in terms of things like disciplinary measures, removals -- removals from school, that those are decreasing and improving within the sites there.

And then we're also excited to say that we've heard recently from our -- not recently -- several months ago that we were able and eligible to apply for a concurrent Project AWARE grant to bring three more sites on board. We've applied for that, and I feel like we have a strong application, and we look forward to hearing back from SAMHSA, to bring on three additional sites and continue to scale that work across the state.

I also feel like with some of the movement that we have moving forward that this is going to be work that's continued to be scalable once we move beyond having access to grant funds, that we've just learned an incredible amount from these districts. Other districts are very clearly interested in the work and applying that and then investing in that with fiscal resources that they have. So really excited about that.

Also, want to share some of our work

that we have done to align with the State Board our strategic plan, which we have shared, and this is very specific. It's based on educational equity, but very specifically focused on significant disproportionality in EC, so looking to see when we have disproportionality across races related to the continuum of placement, the identification category, and then in discipline.

Again, we've had multiple sites that

Again, we've had multiple sites that we have brought into another grant opportunity that we have that, again, is referred to as ARISE. We've had a number of sessions with them where we've worked through systematic problem-solving models, plan developments, looking systemically at what kind of things need to happen, not just in special education, but also in general education to really work on prevention of significant -- of disproportionate placements and discipline and then identification as well.

So having good success with the sites that we've worked with that and are now moving to scale that with other sites that are on our warning list and on our significant disproportionality list. We learned the things that work well, what are the things that we

need -- that didn't work as well, and then how can we apply that to work with other LEAs and districts. And so I'm excited about that work moving forward.

And so I just kind of want to say that social and emotional learning really sits at the core and the universal support that is part of all three of these areas, and so it really plays a critical role. We're fortunate that we have a group of folks at DPI that are across divisions that have a really good deep knowledge of the research behind SEL and how to implement it well. And so I'm going to talk through just some of the plans that we have for that, what we've done, and what the plans for moving forward are.

Alexis, if you can go to the next slide. So we have developed and really worked with a national partner in the development of what's referred to as the theory of action. So, basically, if we do X, Y, and Z activities, how do we expect that would impact associated outcomes with that. And so the major key areas that are a part of this are around building a foundational support plan, strengthening adult SEL competencies and capacities.

So what we've seen from the research is really clear that before we go into deep work with students, that we need to ensure that there's a clear understanding of what those social—emotional competencies are and that they are modeled and shared by adult staff members. That then we begin promoting that for students, and then we engage in ongoing continuous improvement and evaluation.

And so just in terms of some of the highlights of what's happened in North Carolina in regard to this theory of action, North Carolina has developed a vision and goals for SEL. We've also began to do some -- or have completed some standards mapping with social and emotional learning and so something that really has been critical with this work, and what we hear from parents and from the field is that this can't be something that's done separate and apart from everything else that's happening in school on a daily basis.

So rather than developing a set of standards for North Carolina related to social and emotional learning, essentially what we've done is looked at those self-competencies and how can

those be embedded into other standards so that they're occurring continuously throughout the day and embedded within the academic instruction that's occurring.

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

Also have been working a lot on modeling and sharing the 3 Signature Practices of social and emotional learning which include making sure that there's an opening activity for anything that occurs that allows for engagement and for everybody to be ready and in a good space to participate in a lesson or participate in the course of the day, engagement strategies that are evidence-based throughout the course of that, and then, also, closing each activity with a question or item that has an optimistic closure in terms of what the next steps will be. That's something that we have begun embedding in our meetings at DPI, with our Division, also when we're working with districts, and have had a lot of success with that.

We also have been able to -- as part of the -- well, the ARISE project has supported this to some extent as well as Project AWARE -- begun an North Carolina SEL and Equity project.

Again, this is focused a lot on districts who have

had -- been on the warning list or the significant disproportionality list where we've provided ongoing support and coaching on the standards mapping, the signature practices, and different ways to embed social and emotional learning within the context of the day. We have 42 PSUs that have been involved with that who are reporting good outcomes from that, and we're excited about continuing to scale that work as well.

If you'll go to the next slide. I did want to make you aware of just some resources, again, that are available on our current website. If you just go to the NC DPI website search, which you will see at the top of the screen here, social and emotional learning, we have -- it will bring you to this page that has a number of resources that include both national and state resources.

And if you'll go to the next slide,

Alexis. There are a number of state resources

that have been developed by folks here related to

arts education that focuses on a number of things

that can be done through art, a self-care series,

also integrating SEL into the content areas that I

just described previously and some webinars

related to that, the actual standards mapping

document and the table around that and then also some of the realignment with those standards with the Core SEL Competencies that have been identified by the national organization and through their research.

And this is just an example of one of those resources which is -- that you'd be able to download from that website, which is the actual standards mapping final document. You can see the content areas that are there, then the resources that are available in PDF, and guided communication around different connections that can be made with the SEL competencies and within that specific content area and ways that this could be embedded within the class.

And you can see also that a lot of these are -- they're done by grade level to ensure that those competencies are aligned to the level of the content that's being shared and that those are appropriately aligned.

So I want to -- that's some of the major work that's happening with SEL right now, but I really would love to hear some feedback from this Council in terms of this work, what you're experiencing, your recommendations. All of that

So if you'll go to that one. So

North Carolina was notified in probably October or
so of 2019 that we would be receiving a

differentiated monitoring and support visit. I

think our last monitoring visit from OSEP had been
2009 or 2011. It had been a long time, and so we
were due.

And they had some criteria, and as you look at that report, one of the things you will see is where they've listed some of the criteria that raised us up to the level of getting a monitoring visit, and one of the things was that we had a new EC director within two years, that we have a large number of charter schools, that we have a large grant allotment amount from OSEP.

And so there were some things listed that kind of raised us up to the level of having that monitoring visit, and so I wanted to explain that. It's not that we necessarily did anything to cause that part. It's just, as they review data, as we review monitoring of LEAs, there are sometimes that we have those that are brand-new, for example, that we go in to make sure we monitor the first year. So all that was pretty ordinary and up front.

So our visit was the week of January 27th through the 31st. They were in the building for three and a half days and then spent two days out in LEAs. There was a team that went to a charter school, there was a team that went to a district in this region, and a team that went to a district in the Southwest Region. And so for two days, they visited with school teams. They visited a high school, a middle school, and an elementary school, and they had meetings with their central office staff.

We had staff that accompanied them but did not sit in on any of those internal meetings with the elementary, the middle, or the high school staff or the central office staff. So we were there just to provide support, to be able to answer any questions that they may have after those meetings, but we were not as staff engaged in those meetings with OSEP and the LEAs.

We were given a timeline that we should have a report back in about 90 days. That obviously did not occur. It was a year later and almost 90 days. So we would get additional questions throughout the last year. We've provided additional clarification. We've provided

additional documentation on the areas that they were focused on reviewing.

And as you look in the report, you can see they hit some specific areas, looking at our physical monitoring process and our subrecipient funding and monitoring, which is where we push our IDEA dollars out to the local districts. They looked at our general supervision from a compliance standpoint and, in particular, with the due processes that we have in place. They looked at MTSS as it related to the eligibility for SLD and the whole functionality of the MTSS framework in North Carolina, the requirements, any barriers, any problems, any hiccups, whatever.

And then we had gone to OSEP back in 2017 and asked for technical assistance and guidance around some issues we were having where private residential psychiatric treatment facilities in other states, and in one state in particular, were reaching out to us at the Department asking for funding for students from North Carolina, who were North Carolina residents, that had been placed in those private residential -- private psychiatric residential

treatment facilities.

I'm going to call that PRTF from now on. Hopefully, you'll understand what that means, but I get -- it gets tangled when I try to get all that terminology out.

So PRTFs in other states where students have been placed not by an IEP team, not by a school setting, not a recommendation from the school, and many times the schools really don't know that student has been moved to that residential treatment facility. So that's what has been happening.

So we asked for guidance. We asked for guidance again in 2018 when I became the director or the interim director. We asked for guidance again in 2019 after I was director. So multiple, multiple asks of OSEP for guidance, for clarity, for alignment to IDEA, to give us the policy piece that would give us the guidance.

We never got that. They instead put that on the monitoring visit as areas they were going to investigate. And so they talked to school districts about how students are placed in a private residential -- psychiatric residential treatment facility, a PRTF. We've had multiple

calls with them since their monitoring visit
throughout 2020 with the Department of Health and
Human Services, our partners there, because they
manage the PRTFs in North Carolina. They license
the PRTFs in North Carolina. So we were using
their guidance to look at what other states might
require, how students are getting into those
facilities in other states.

All that to say, we started this with asking for guidance, and they included that topic in the monitoring report and now have given us corrective action. So, in essence, we still don't have guidance. We still don't have clarity. We will be writing a response to the report probably next week, getting that out to them, and then we have a call with OSEP on Friday, I believe, the 18th to talk through this monitoring report, to discuss any areas where we have questions or concerns or need additional clarity.

I do know we have some new council members and I wanted you to at least have that whole story and picture. So, as you will see in the report, we have corrective action that is due 90 days from the receipt of that report, which was May 18th, so

that puts our corrective action at about the 12th of August.

that we have a process in place to ensure that reallocations of the IDEA Part B funding is going to serve students who may be in an LEA that has elected not to apply for funds. There's already a practice in place within our School Business Division because this is really not something we have control over, can control, distribute. We don't allot.

We give them the list of districts that have completed -- or LEAs that have completed their grant -- and I'm talking about all LEAs, charter and traditional -- and then they create the funding formula. They send out the allotments. They create the planning allotment. They do all that business work. We just ensure that that has gone out, that they have the appropriate information. So there's already a process in that they redistribute those funds. In particular, we usually have -- if someone chooses not to complete the grant and access those federal funds, it's -- I've never seen a traditional district do that. It's typically been a few of

1 our cha

our charter schools. And so those funds from that LEA would go back to that LEA to serve students.

So while it's been done, they couldn't find it in writing anywhere that was that explicit in the procedure in the policy manual for our funding. So that has been a corrective action that we will be working on with our School Business Division to get that language appropriately in the guidance documents to clarify that. So that will be Corrective Action Number 1.

was that we submit a sample template that includes the subrecipient awards -- so that's the federal money that we flow through to the LEAs -- with the grant award number that's called the GAN. So every year when we get the IDEA grant to the Department, it has a number that identifies it as IDEA funds and it also helps track what the year of those funds are. So when federal dollars through IDEA grants are released to an agency, they have a 27-month shelf life, for lack of a better term. So those funds are live, useable, available up to 27 months for both the state and the district.

And so this template -- this report

that they've asked us to create is not specific to just IDEA. There was actually a state audit finding that no federal programming in North Carolina DPI was getting that consistent letter like we get from OSEP that says this is the GAN number, this is the availability of the years of these funds. That's already been done. That's already in place.

grant system, and it will also come out from School Business. But we have to ensure that that is done. We have to send them a copy, but this is being done for all federal programs in DPI. It's just an additional step that needed to be done in the notification system, and so that will be -- is in the process, and that will certainly go out -- as the awards are granted for the '21-22 IDEA grant years, they will receive this template and this document. So we can kind of check that one off our list as well.

Corrective Action 3 had to do with follow-up around the SEA state complaint that was filed around the absence of Child Find being implemented due to MTSS. And so they basically repeated all of the corrective actions we had

those practices are in place.

4 5

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

already put in place for the agency and the requirements that we need from LEAs to ensure that

So we had to detail the status of implementing -- interestingly, we've already provided them the entire corrective action plan so they already had this, but it has, again, been included in our report. So ensuring that we've implemented the corrective action statewide with all LEAs.

That we can demonstrate that problemsolving teams have discussed any child currently in any tier of intervention whether or not they need to be considered for referral, and that's looking back to data pre-COVID to ensure that we haven't lost kids during the pandemic and the adjustment of school to virtual to hybrid, however school was done for the last year and a half.

And then documenting and demonstrating that the child's parent or parents have been involved in the problem-solving team's discussions because part of that state complaint was that even though we have put that in guidance through MTSS training, through webinars, and technical assistance that our division has

provided, we still found some instances where parents had not been included in those problemsolving discussions.

And so there is a form to document to submit that is required now, and so, again, we've got these corrective actions already in place, but we will be responding to these corrective actions as well in our reporting back by August 12th.

Corrective Action 4 was that we create and then submit to OSEP a mechanism to ensure that due process hearing decisions are implemented within a time frame that was prescribed by the hearing officer. We typically get that information, and we get the information from the LEA or from the parent if the due process corrective actions have not been in place, but we have not had, basically, a follow-up letter like we do with our state complaints.

Once we complete a state complaint investigation, we send out a letter and a report that capsulizes the complaint, the investigation, the data, the documentation that was provided, and then if there is a finding of noncompliance, what that corrective action is. We have not had that in place with due process hearings because we

really have no engagement in a due process 2 hearing, but this corrective action is requiring us to create and do a follow-up, which will 3 probably be a very similar follow-up letter with the corrective action rolled out that was ordered 5 6 by the hearing officer and the time frame 7 included.

1

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If there wasn't a time frame, then we are being required to create that in our procedures as we do that follow-up as well. that is something that Carol Ann and her team, I think, are already actually working on to meet that corrective action item.

Go to the next slide. And then this goes back to the private residential -psychiatric residential treatment facilities. we have two sets of corrective actions for this item. We have to identify, locate, and evaluate students with disabilities who may be in a PRTF in another state but are -- their domicile or their state of residence is North Carolina, their parents are still in North Carolina.

We have to find those kids across the country in any state that has been placed there. We have to determine if they were publicly placed.

So if DHHS, which is a state agency, placed these students, if a local management entity who is working in a contract relationship with a local DSS or a local health department have placed these students, if the judicial system has placed these students, those would all be state-placed decisions.

So we have to identify those students. We have to determine if they were then placed by that public or that state entity, and if so, we have to ensure that FAPE is being provided to that student placed in a PRTF outside of North Carolina.

If you'll go to the next slide. The second phase of this corrective action is that we also provide a detailed description of the steps that we have taken to identify, locate, and evaluate, the steps we have identified and put in place to ensure that students are identified and FAPE is available and then any additional steps. So, in other words, what is our new procedure for tracking these students to ensure they are receiving FAPE.

So that looks like a lot when we really get it down to a granular level. I feel

like most of this was already in process or in place or was being taken care of. So I feel like there are very few corrective actions that we have to put in place, but the biggest concern we have is with the PRTFs because we still don't believe they have at OSEP a clear understanding that these students are not being placed by a state agency, and we have no way of knowing where those students are because there's no mechanism and no requirement for the State to be notified or for the district to be notified if it's not from an IEP team placement.

So we're going to have that further conversation on the 18th and hope we get a little more clarity with them, and we will update you if there any adjustments to this Differentiated

Monitoring and Support Report. And now I will pause, because I've been talking for a long time, to see if we have any questions.

MS. UTZ: There are none in the chat box.

MS. THOMAS: Then, I either bored you to death or I gave you way too much information or it was clear enough that you don't have questions now. If you do later, please feel free to shoot

THE CHAIRPERSON: So I don't have a list before me of the members of that group,

24

25

email from Public Speaker 1. Whoops. I'm supposed to take her name off. Sorry. Oh, it's there anyway. I put it up on your screen. She is Public Speaker 1. She is a Global National and State of NC Ambassador and advocate for children with long COVID syndrome. She lives in North Carolina, is the mother of a 12-year-old, postacute COVID-19 daughter.

She is encouraging the Council to consider a plan of actions and safety net within each school district -- for each district, school, and EC department. There are none for these children. As a medical career of 26 years, this is not my first pandemic. We are also learning about how postacute COVID-19 affects children. Children who are asymptomatic or with mild acute COVID infections, mostly females, are at high risk to develop pediatric postacute COVID-19, and the variants increase the risk of transmission and seriousness of the SARS-CoV-2 for children, adolescents, and those adult teachers that are just starting out.

Honestly, my district did not know how to handle my child's medical diagnosis.

Children should not have to worry about their

education and their health impacts from long COVID. So I comment today to learn about pediatric postacute COVID-19 transmission/variants in order to meet the needs of these children and families. And that was the only email that we had received today.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And while she requested a comment, we as the Council cannot comment or opine on the various comments that we receive. What we can do is possibly ask for a presentation on children -- on how we're dealing effectively with chronic childhood issues in school in general.

Any other thoughts?

MS. COFFEY: Cynthia, I second that. We probably need to know what is there before we even -- because it could end up being an unmet need, but until we know what's already in effect, it would be hard to know that. So we would need that almost first.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS. MOOREFIELD: And wouldn't children who -- who are affected by this long term -- wouldn't they also fall under -- like if their health affected their learning, wouldn't

they also fall under a 504? Or is this mother saying that, you know, those children that have to be out of school for a long term because of illnesses such as COVID? I'm not really sure what she's asking.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So she's not really clear about what she's asking, but she seems to say that her school district seems not to have any idea of how to help her -- her child. And I looked it up because I honestly did not know the impact of this long-term -- long COVID syndrome, and some of the things are fatigue, shortness of breath, joint pain, chest pain, memory and concentration problems. So I thought that might have an educational impact.

MS. MOOREFIELD: It seems, though, that there are several other, you know, diseases and syndromes with similar impacts. So I'm not sure what it was that her district was not -- you know, was confused on how to handle.

THE CHAIRPERSON: And that's it, Virginia. That's why I thought we might get a presentation on what we're doing in general overall to handle children who have different chronic needs.

MS. COMBS: Cynthia, when you say "do a presentation," to do that, is the intended

24

25

1 audience families?

THE CHAIRPERSON: So the presentation might be to the Council so we can share that out to our networks and the places that we're involved.

Aimee, you're from ECAC. So certainly something ECAC might want to think about if this is a concern across the actual state of North Carolina for these children who have this particular syndrome and any general chronic disorder.

MS. COMBS: We don't specifically get a lot of calls on stuff like this. We have in the past had a few such as like the condition of PANDAS where there's just a lot of unknowns and unfamiliarity -- I can't say that word -- with the condition. But, you know, certainly if we were talking to a parent about this, obviously, we would need more information.

Because if they had an IEP, then they would already be covered under Section 504, but then we would say, you know, "Take a look at the IEP. You might want to revisit it with the team. There's a spot that asks is there any medical conditions or any relevant medical information

that we need to know more about, and then the team could work together to say how they want to address it."

Some students will have an IEP and an individualized health plan. So if one of those is not -- you know, like most things, it really depends and it's not a one-size-fits-all, but it's things that schools should have in place, you know, whether they have healthcare plans, a 504, an IEP, it should be -- it should be that there's already things in place.

It may be that the confusion is we haven't heard of this, which would make sense.

COVID's new for pretty much all of us, and so that folks are still finding their way. And we're still learning about some of the long-term effects, but it doesn't mean that there isn't already things in place that could address it.

But, yeah, not a bad idea to get something together to give folks the information they need to make informed decisions on how they want to address such a thing.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So I'm thinking a presentation from someone from the EC Division and then possibly maybe a little blurb in the news

1 letter that goes out every month.

MS. MOOREFIELD: Cynthia, do you think we would be able to get anyone like -- I guess they would fall under infectious disease experts that might be doing research on how COVID affects children long term. I know that the news has been talking to one of the professors over at Duke, but you know, reaching out to either Chapel Hill or Duke -- they both have infectious disease research facilities there -- to see if -- you know, to see if they have any findings or if they're seeing anything or if they're doing any studies, or whatever, that might tell us a little bit how -- you know, what we can be looking for as far as how this affects kids long term.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And who's handling that? Is the Department of Health and Human Services in North Carolina doing some of the work of getting the information out to us that comes through the CDC about the impact of COVID?

MS. MOOREFIELD: I'm guessing Mandy Cohen. Isn't that the -- isn't that our kind of medical person statewide?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

MS. UTZ: Yeah, and that's Health and

mentioned some things now. But at our last meeting, you would get some guidance, you know, to kind of guide us, because we were new to the subcommittee, as to what we were supposed to be doing. And I know who's on the call that's in the subcommittee today that I would be meeting with so that -- you know, just so that---

THE CHAIRPERSON: So, Kenya, this differentiated monitoring and supports report that we have that's in the Google docs---

MS. POPE: Right. And I don't have access to Google docs. Miss Alexis has just emailed me some things. I haven't had an opportunity to look at anything prior to today.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. So that's basically what that committee does. It looks at the Reports and Data that come out every year. We get reports from what's going on in terms of state complaints, the facilitated IEPs, the due process hearings. All of those things are things that the Data and Reports Committee looks at.

We look at things like the number of students in special ed across the state. All those things that are reported, that are data that the EC Division collects and reports out, those

	Quarterly Meeting June 9, 2021 Page 97
1	MS. COFFEY: This is Diane. I motion
2	we adjourn and go into committee work.
3	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Diane.
4	A second?
5	MS. HODGES: I second that motion.
6	
	This is Kristen Hodges.
7	THE CHAIRPERSON: Any abstentions?
8	(No audible response.)
9	THE CHAIRPERSON: Anyone opposed?
10	(No audible response.)
11	THE CHAIRPERSON: And all in favor?
12	(Multiple members responded aye.)
13	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Alexis,
14	for breaking us out into the breakout rooms and
15	thank you all and have a wonderful summer.
16	(At 11:54 a.m., the proceeding
17	adjourned.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Rebecca P. Scott