

REALTIME FILE

D/HH/DB Council  
The School Age Subcommittee  
Tuesday, February 8, 2023

CART CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:  
White Coat Captioning

\* \* \* \*

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility. CART captioning and this real-time file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, I think we can get started. Linda will be joining us a minute or two late and Rebecca emailed me a half hour or so ago, she also will be late. Given that we only have an hour and everyone is so busy, I think we need to get going.

Cassie, can you hear us okay, are you there?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I can, I just keep finding this morning when I turn my video on, I'm choppy and other people become choppy.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's fine, I just want to be sure we had you there, thank you, good morning. Laura Siegel won't be joining us.

We want to go through the proposal we have drafted. I want to emphasize that it's a draft. It is due relatively soon, like February 16th or so, 15th or 16th, somewhere in there. Sherry just got the template the other day.

So this is a quick effort to at least give us a starting point. And maybe, Sherry, you want to say a few things.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sure, this is the Vermont special ed administrators and conference, it's well-attended, two days, in Burlington this year. It's you're at creepy Lake Mori but it got so big they moved it to

Burlington.

It really is an opportunity to bring those groups of leaders, sometimes special ed teachers attend or like one step down, the superintendent or sped director, individuals attend.

A little diverse group and it's an opportunity to share thinking. I have two different student groups also presenting on that day. One is talking about an intensive literacy program we have at our middle school, high school.

And another group of students I have are presenting on some of the equity work we're doing in student voice. So students involved, parents involved, so it's a really -- it's one of the biggest conferences that at the educational level that is attended.

And I don't know, maybe I've had like 30 to 50 people at a time. So they're small sessions. It's not like you're going to have 500. People get to choose. The first day, which is the Thursday, in the afternoon, tends to be school leaders doing presentations.

The next day in the morning is often students. So that's when my student groups are going to be presenting. So yeah, and it's a pretty welcoming group. We'll get some questions.

I think it's going to be our opportunity to really pitch it to special ed directors as a way and kind of, you know, Sharon and I have been going back and forth, I'll be really honest.

The way school leaders and superintendents are thinking about the Agency of Education right now, we're going to do good in lieu of AOE, because it doesn't exist. We don't have an sped director for the state of Vermont. Cassie is working way too much. The Agency of Education has their attention, otherwise, other places. They have key positions now filled including our finance director, special ed director, lots of other key positions.

It really goes to individual school districts to make the change.

That's what's going to happen. So our audience, I think about, our sped directors who really want to do a good job, the ones I've worked with, because I used to be a sped director, they want to offer a high quality program to students who are Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind, for the most part.

I think that the problem now we run into is how do you make that decision. And they are the ones controlling the pursestrings. Let's be really -- they're the ones that are funding these programs in terms of, I'm going to contract with this group, individual, whomever, to provide the services.

The onus is on them to have a good product, right? Because if there's going to be a suit, if a parent is going to sue a district, it's the district that's going to be paying the bill, it's not Agency of Education. So accountability lands on the doorstep of the sped director and the superintendent.

For them, having a tool such as this, in terms of litigation, is a really good thing. Plus if you get sued by a parent and you say, well, I used a tool based on a national tool, blah blah blah blah, that's something sped directors should be looking for.

It should be and -- you know, and so for the directors who are not doing it because it's the right thing to do and they're doing it to stay out of litigation, whichever, it's still a good tool. And it really, for our students, and that's what's most important, for our children, this is how we as a group are going to make sure there's high quality programming offered.

Those are kind of some thoughts from Sharon and I. Agency of Education has their handsful. Special ed directors and superintendents are the ones really making the day to day decisions. They're the ones with the handles on the pursestrings. They're the ones who are going to be held

accountable. AOE is never sued. It's individual districts.

And so I think that's why we have some real interest in this presentation.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, that's a great overview and segue into why we want to continue to do this work. As you saw, the proposal template is quite short. And in my conversations with Sherry, she has emphasized that this group likes a highly interactive presentation to keep their attention.

They need to walk away with three or four key takeaways, because they're moving from our one-hour presentation to maybe three or four other ones during the course of the day. And we really want this to stick.

So what I didn't put in the email but what we want to begin to think about and have conversations about is when the question comes up at the end of this session, would you please come and help train our group on how to use this tool or how do we get additional training on how to use this tool.

That's a conversation that I've had with Linda and with Sherry to a lesser extent on what could we offer, and anticipate -- in anticipation of those questions. I think as Sherry has alluded to, there will be people who are wanting to do the right thing, who want to be engaged, who want to learn more. So what can the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind council offer this group.

So with that overview, I think I want to direct our attention to the two parts of the proposal that I think need your input. One is the description of the proposed workshop, and then the means of engagement.

I think once we get those two things squared away, the other parts, like what other bios do we include, do we like our title, that will fall into place fairly easily. I sent you a copy of the document of the proposal, thank you, Tracy, for your comments so far on the Google Drive.

So I'll just start with Tracy's comment, which was, based on the

description, do we want to use the same language that we have in the statute. And I personally think that's a really great idea, because that is the legislative mandate to which we are responding, and that was the charge that was given to us by the chair of the council, was to respond to that charge.

So I can certainly make that change. I think the other thing is, I thought about it, based on what Sherry just said, the other thing I might propose to the group is adding really clear language that this is current best practice.

And so we're trying to elevate whatever is happening out there now to the current best practice. And so that would be my other suggestion. Now that I've had the weekend away from the document and had a chance to think about it.

Jen, what are your comments on this portion?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think it's a great start. I like the interactiveness. I think that it's going to be great. And then I agree with Tracy's comments about the language.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, great. Amelia? And it's great to see you, Amelia, I'm so glad you're here.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Thank you. It's been a really, really busy fall and winter. I have not had a chance to open it and look through it with everything that we've had going on.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Well, feel free to add comments after our meeting today if you do have time, because it's on our Google Drive.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: I just haven't seen the most recent one you sent out.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sure. Linda?

>> LINDA HAZARD: I wanted to let everyone know I have been in contact with two school districts. I sent emails to the sped directors and I had

responses in less than five minutes from them, and they're very excited to participate. So we're working through the details of putting this out as, you know, a quality improvement initiative trial.

So I thought that would also be good for you all to know.

>> SHARON HENRY: Great. We have you later on on the agenda too, Linda, to say a few more words about that.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Do you think they might attend this workshop and maybe give their perspective?

>> LINDA HAZARD: I think it might be too early, but I will definitely ask. And I think that just given their responses so far and their excitement about the tool, that they might be willing to do that.

>> SHARON HENRY: And Cassie, any comments or questions about the description of the proposed workshop so far?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I also have not had a chance to read it in depth. But I was previewing it when we were talking. I love the mock IEP, just wanted to say that, that's a really helpful interactive piece to have with something like this. Otherwise, I will give it a deeper look.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you so much. So in terms of the description to the proposed workshop, I'll make the two changes that Tracy and I have offered. And so let's talk now about the next section which involves the means of engagement.

And when Sherry and Linda and I conceptualized this, we conceptualized two mock sessions: one more complex, involved, and another one that also highlighted that the tool can be used for technical assistance and for consultation.

Those were two initial ideas. And then Tracy has added a few more ideas which I think are worthwhile to consider, and those are would there be different types of IEP meetings that we could enact. There can be an evaluation plan, there can be an determination meeting, there could be an

annual IEP meeting or 504.

So the two sessions that we have time for could come in a variety of flavors. So how do we get our biggest bang for the buck, how do we craft these fictional scenarios, and then what key aspects of the tool do we want to highlight. Sherry has offered to moderate, facilitate the mock IEP, and at certain points, do sort of a pause and bring the audience's attention to one particular aspect that we're trying to highlight.

So those are a lot of things to think about, but I think it's really critical in how we shape these two scenarios. And we're thinking we would probably have about 20 minutes per scenario.

So initial thoughts on the type of meeting?

>> TRACY HINCK: I kind of like the idea -- this is Tracy -- of having an annual IEP, because I think those are most common. That's where we're looking at the services that are in place, we're looking at progress, we're looking at present levels, we're looking at data on goals and updating goals.

And I think that would be a good way to look at the tool also in terms of qualified providers, measurable goals, high expectations, including the family, all the things we've considered in the tool.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you. Other thoughts on this? Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I agree, Tracy, I think that makes the most sense. The other one, I'm a little torn. I like the idea of a less I'll say intensive needs student, you know, that maybe does just require technical assistance or consultation.

I guess another question is, could this be a 504 meeting? Or do we think that it definitely needs to be called an IEP meeting? Because I think that that's something that would be good to sort of address, this is not just for kids that are on an IEP, although it is written by the National Association For State Directors of Special Ed,

so that is a little bit -- I think that that could come into question if it is just for kids on an IEP or not even though I know when we wrote the tool, we really trying to include all 504 IEP or other types of educational plans.

I don't know, Sherry, if you have thoughts about that.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm wondering if, you know, often what we do, when we have a complex student, we have a pre-meeting. And so the provider with the special ed case manager will prepare for a meeting and have a consultation around how do make sure we're addressing it.

Maybe the first meeting, how would that consultation piecework? If you're the special ed case manager, you're meeting with a service provider, you've got the tool in front of you, and so maybe we can show what the tool -- how the tool can help frame a high quality meeting.

Then we take a pause and come back, and we actually have the IEP meeting and we show, with good consultation and preparation and communication between the school and the provider, look at how we can elevate this meeting.

That's the opportunity, because by law we can have a pre-meeting. And that's really an opportunity to think about, okay, now let's think about the goals and let's think about how -- it would be nice to really have -- methodologies what a good dynamic between the school and a provider could look like. And how that tool could be a facilitator of a high quality conversation between a school and a provider.

>> SHARON HENRY: Linda, you had your hand up.

>> LINDA HAZARD: Yes. Sherry, I like that. I was also just going to say that when we met with Cheryl DeConde Johnson, she did state the NASDE guidelines are for students both on IEPs and 504 plans. So I didn't want us to eliminate the 504 idea, because I think that's important as well.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, I would agree with that. And the other



language in our tool, I went back and looked at it last night quickly, is the EST plan. And I've already forgotten what that acronym stands for [laughter]. But do we need to roll that in?

I think given the need to highlight consultation and technical assistance, maybe we divide the time, so it's 25 minutes on the complex IEP, and then 15 minutes on the more straightforward 504 consultation TA, would be another way to manage our time. That's a thought. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm wondering too, because technical assistance and consultation, it doesn't always mean that those services are for kids with less intense needs. Like, you can have consultations from a teacher of the Deaf on an IEP of a very complex needs student.

So I think that, you know, whatever plan they're on, if we present this, I really like how Sherry suggested that, that we have the pre-meeting, where we look at all of those services, right? We would look at consultation, direct instruction, technical assistance, any need by a qualified provider that we're looking at.

And then we hold the IEP to talk about what services that student needs and the justification for that based on the tool. So I think it can kind of be embedded, and if people have questions, the simple answer is this tool could be used for any student who is Deaf, Hard of Hearing, or DeafBlind, and it's irrelevant to the plan they're on.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: The components are different, a lot of our feedback was around the fact that the nature of the plans is different and therefore the requirements are different. So an EST plan wouldn't typically have goals or services or even notes or minutes the way a 504 plan might.

They also might have those things. But it's not mandated in the way it is in an IEP.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: But the MTSS is really clear, you still need

benchmarking for an EST plan, you need to have what is the intervention.

In terms of the gold standard of an EST in MTSS, in we're going to go by the -- not the guidebook but -- that's something we're working on, that our EST plans need to be much more substantial, we need minutes, we need parent input.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: Some of that feedback came directly from the AOE's MTSS team. Maybe connecting with Tracy would be a good thing to do so she can talk more about how those plans manifest differently and why you might want to articulate that, especially when joining a mock sort of meeting.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Those are good points to keep in mind, that there are differences. But fundamentally, high quality services with accountability is the take-home message across all services, right?

So we can maybe frame it that way as well. So to back up for one second, I wanted to welcome Rebecca to the meeting. She had to come a little bit late. And just ask Rebecca if you had any comments on the description of the proposed workshop or on the means of engagement.

>> REBECCA: No, I looked over it briefly. You all are more in depth with your educational background, I just bring the ASL perspective. So I did look over it and I really just kind of know that our goal for this setting is for effective services for these kiddoes, right? We want them to have that access, we want them to be meeting their goals.

We're looking at this to be a successful tool for consultations, make sure we find the right person. I'm really looking forward to having this tool available.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Rebecca. So the other thing, to frame these two mock sessions, whether IEPs or 504s, we can figure that out, what we thought is a ten-minute overview or even seven-minute overview of how we got to this point.

So a little bit of background on the council, when the council was

formed, what its function is, and how the School Age Subcommittee came into being, and how we did this work over the last year or so.

So given that requires no educational expertise, I could do that. And I'm happy to do that. And then Linda would take five minutes or so and introduce to the group that she has worked with two school districts to date, and give a little bit of an overview of that, to set the stage.

And then we would go into mock session number 1 for 20 minutes or so, and then do mock session number 2, both of which would be mediated by Sherry, again, stopping at critical points to highlight how the tool works, how it can be leveraged, et cetera, et cetera.

And then we would finish up with five or ten minutes, Linda giving a summary of the debriefing from both of those school districts and how they have used the tool, what their experience has been as part of the quality initiative project that she's initiating with them.

That's how the 60 minutes would go by in a flash. We talked about choosing the longer session but Sherry is advising against that right now. So maybe in the future we would do that.

So how does that sound, for an overall plan? Are we missing any opportunities to drive messages home? And did I represent everything accurately, Linda? Okay. No comments on that.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think it sounds good, Sharon. This is Jen. I do think it's important to give the overview and talk in general about the NASDE guidelines, optimizing outcomes, just give a little bit of background about them. I do think it's important that these are, you know, the best practices in Deaf education.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right, right. Yeah, the tool didn't come out of the blue, we didn't just have nothing to do last spring and -- yes, it's based on best practice.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And I think like the first scenario, maybe ten minutes, I don't think that has to be 20 minutes. Again, please know, attention spans of school administrators are very short. Very short.

>> SHARON HENRY: I'm glad you said that and not me, Sherry.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Oh, I can say it because I do presentations all the time. If I can't get it said in ten minutes, we're done. They pull you off the stage. So I think, you know, maybe we do the consultation, a ten-minute let's work through this, look at the documents, give opportunities for questions.

Again, you know, whoever does -- you know, whoever does that scenario, I think there's going to be lots of questions for the provider and Jen or Tracy can do that kind of conversation from their side of things.

I think the more dynamic we can make it. And then, okay, now we're going to transition, we've done our pre-meeting, now let's look at how does that play out. I know templates, they love to have access, we can put it in the PowerPoint. If we have a template for an agenda, Jen, I know you have some great resources, people go back to those.

So, you know, that would be really helpful. They want things they can step out the door and use. And I think a really good agenda that allows and incorporates all the different parts of our tool, those kind of things, how it's introduced, you know, having a script on how do we introduce this tool to a school team, parent, that would be really important, what's the basis, why we're using this and the intention, that's kind of read at the beginning of the agenda.

All those ways that we invite families and partner in, teachers, to partner in that conversation so they're in the work and they're not sitting on the sidelines. I think that's a really -- if we can get that message out there as well, maybe there's some documents that, you know, pieces that go ahead of time to parents, so that they can look at and review the tool.

All the different ways that we can make sure this is a full partnership of all people at the table. And it's not just -- and I know Amelia has talked about that, how you feel like someone that's not engaged in the conversation.

Not only do we want to use the tool but we also want to model, what does a really good meeting look like? I haven't been in a special ed meeting in a while, but I know some of the elements that I want to make sure I incorporate.

So I think that's something this whole group can think about as we develop that script, and some of the resources around it. We want to model best case scenario and how this tool helps support best case scenario. When it's done good, what does it look like?

>> SHARON HENRY: And in the description here, and this was Linda's idea, that participants could leave the meeting with a template or templates, depending on what our group decides is actually needed and helpful. So I think we're on agreement in terms of the process, and now we need volunteers to write script 1 and script 2, and volunteers to develop the templates.

So those are our actionable steps. Will the 25 minutes include questions and answers? Not necessarily freeform, Jen. With Sherry as facilitator, we're going to hopefully anticipate the questions and Sherry will be facilitating and stopping the IEP meeting at critical junctures to highlight key points which would hopefully have addressed the likely questions.

So we're going to try to anticipate that, because we only have 60 minutes.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Right, that's what I was wondering, if we needed to think about the timing. So, okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, obviously you always have to be flexible when presenting to a group you've never met before, at least most of us haven't

met them, Sherry's met them a million times. I think we also need to have -- the last line has to be, and if you want more information, contact so and so. Or there will be a conference in July, please plan to attend.

Something like that. So writing of the two scenarios, drafting the templates, and then Linda, do you want to say anything about planning, any sort of July conference and what the options might be there?

>> LINDA HAZARD: Sure. One of the other discussions that Sharon and I had was, you know, if special educators are interested in learning more, that we could potentially do a workshop in July, which I fully support, because I think this would be really helpful to have another opportunity for those who are interested in learning more about it.

I did want to comment on -- about the parent, you know, send the information to parents. That is one of the questions that I talked with the special ed directors about. And I think that, you know, I'm going to be asking for some input on that so that we can make sure that it's presented so that parents feel included and know what this tool is hoping to achieve.

And then the third statement, and this is just -- it's not related to our tool, but it's related at a more Federal, national level. I participate in a Federal, national meeting quarterly, and I did introduce the Vermont tool, the tool developed by the council, as well as sent out our guidelines for NASDE that Vermont developed from the NASDE document. We also have OCEP that joins us for these meetings and also the Federal partners of CDC and OCEP.

Congress is really looking at having us -- you know, wanting more information about student outcomes for Deaf and Hard of Hearing, because for 20 years they've been significantly putting -- or putting significant funds into programs and now they want to go further, they want to understand evaluating services for not only early intervention but also

school age students.

And then also, you know, looking at outcome measures that should be implemented. So there is a lot of talk at the Federal level. And I just really wanted, you know, people to be aware of what's going on there.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, thank you. So I sort of see two tasks that we need to do. One is, have volunteers to craft each one of these two scenarios, volunteers to maybe craft the templates, or maybe that's part of the writing of the case scenario, and then helping to plan this July conference.

I think Amelia and I as parents should probably be involved to provide the parent perspective in terms of formulating the scenarios and making them feel included. But we obviously need the professional experts who run the meetings to be on there too.

So I'm looking at Tracy and Jen and Linda. And you've attended probably so many IEP meetings, you could write one in your sleep. But -- so maybe what we can do is you could craft something and then share it with the group or put it on our Google Drive.

So that we can make sure we hit all the points that Sherry mentioned before in terms of the inclusivity, it's elevating the meeting, et cetera, et cetera. How does that sound?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I'm happy to help, to be involved in it. I certainly don't want to be the key writer. But I'm happy to help, you know, collaborate with that for sure.

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah, I am too. I'm not completely clear on what the task is. We're crafting a scenario based on a fictional student, so we need kind of an age, hearing profile, an educational profile, and then did we decide that we're going to mock an annual IEP for that student?

And we're also going to have a consultation meeting prior to that meeting, is that kind of what we decided?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I don't think you have to script it word by word. If you maybe think about who is your most typical child, you know, school age, would it be upper elementary, where do you think is the most fodder for that conversation in terms of hitting all the key elements?

I wouldn't want to do an initial meeting. I would like it to be like two or three years into a program so you can talk about progress, you can talk about benchmarking. And I think if you had -- even if we just had the agenda of the IEP meeting, the annual review IEP meeting, and, you know, that would be the framework for the conversation.

I don't think you have to script it word by word. You'll have the, here's -- we're going to -- your opening statement about, here's the tool and here's the purpose of the meeting, blah blah blah, and then -- and maybe you can -- you may already have a vision in mind what have the perfect agenda is in terms of introduction of team members and parental rights and all those kind of things you want to include.

And I think the agenda to me is the script, because then you can talk about, if you're the provider, you know, and maybe somebody plays the role of the -- I don't know. You know, I'm going to talk about why I came up with these present levels of performance and this was informed by year and this and that.

You may be able to take an IEP and work with it and make it so it's not personally identifiable, but it gives you a document and we'll have a draft document for the team to consider. But I think if you have a really tight agenda, that would be helpful.

And I think in terms of the pre-meeting, it's really the conversation between the special ed teacher and the provider around, okay, here's what I'm seeing in class. What goals would you recommend. If we look at the tool for things we want to make sure we include, that would be part of the



conversation.

Maybe the service provider is giving the latest benchmark data. Here is what I've noticed, here is what I've seen over the change of time, here is what I'm thinking of recommending for the student for the New Year.

I think that's a pretty dynamic. Once you have an outline, you guys do these all the time, it's probably second nature for you.

>> TRACY HINCK: Each kid is so unique, I have to be honest. I've been to probably thousands of IEP meetings over the years, but like, they're each very unique. So I really like the idea of modeling the ideal IEP meeting. For our actors, actresses, our participants, are we going to model having everyone at the table that is important for making these decisions?

So will we have a classroom teacher, a special educator, a special service provider, a parent, and an LEA, are all those people going to be there for our mock, or are we going to have some cardboard people, I don't know, what does that look like? How do you envision this? I don't know.

>> SHARON HENRY: We envisioned having all those actors and actresses present.

>> TRACY HINCK: Okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: With having practiced their script. You know, not word for word, as Sherry said, but -- so -- yes, yeah. That's why on the proposal it says "list the others." And others in terms of roles.

>> REBECCA: This is Rebecca. Can I get a little clarification?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, go ahead, Rebecca.

>> REBECCA: For the mock session, the script, is that script something that will show what will happen without the tool and then with the tool? So there's a comparison? Or what is the vision? If you use the tool, this is the way it perfectly works out. What's the vision?

>> SHARON HENRY: Sherry, you want to respond to that?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Rebecca, I think if we have the time, that would be ideal. I'm hoping, just as we do as teachers, to show, here's the model, and work for the model. I think so many families and special ed directors have done it wrong for so long, I would really love to give them, here's the ideal.

Not the ideal. Here's the standard for a quality IEP meeting. Does that make sense? I'm afraid if we show -- we all have a vision of what bad looks like. But can we have a vision of, here's the standard of practice.

>> REBECCA: That really helps clarify for me. Thank you.

>> SHARON HENRY: I had that same idea, Rebecca, but when I realized we only had 60 minutes, I think modelling the best practices is our only choice. So what was I saying before that? I forget.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And maybe we move away from the language of best practice to standard of practice. I think when we hear "best," you think, I'm going to work toward that. No, this is our standard of practice. I think that gets people off the hook.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Okay. So -- oh, I know, Tracy's question. So in your mock IEP, who are all the players that are typically there? Obviously the parent, the sped Ed director.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Case manager.

>> SHARON HENRY: Case manager.

>> TRACY HINCK: It has to be someone that is representing as the LEA, someone who makes the -- sort of the fiscal decisions, Sherry, is that right?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And I think to minimize what could be and quite often, because we're so resource needing, the special ed case manager can also be the LEA. And they're the ones who have the control over how resources are allocated.

So I think for this purpose, if we had classroom teacher, parent,

providers, and whether we have both SLP -- case manager, parent, providers, general teacher, that meets the standard of practice.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So I think for the purposes of the proposal, where we have to list who the speakers are, I'll just list those roles, and we will identify who those bodies actually are, as we bump along.

I think that -- I think I would love to have Tracy and Jen be the TOD and the audiologist, obviously.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think it would be good to have your bios in our proposal, because I think --

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: If you don't mind including your bios.

>> TRACY HINCK: I can write something and send it to you.

>> SHARON HENRY: Would you please, maybe by the end of the week if possible, same for you, Jen. And then is it okay, Sherry, if we put parent and case manager/LEA to be determined, and the general classroom teacher to be determined? We don't really have a body yet.

Or -- and if the case scenario evolves, what Jen and Tracy draft, if it also needs a speech language pathologist, I could list an SLP in the proposal and say to be determined. Okay. Okay. We're just a little bit short on time in terms of getting -- the deadline's looming. The practical matters.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: And Tracy is an SLP as well, so maybe she can switch hats.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, okay, that's right, that's right, I forgot about that, Tracy, I'm sorry. Right.

>> TRACY HINCK: Gee, thanks, Jen.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Jen.

[Laughter]

>> JEN BOSTWICK: She'll have to run around the table, she can sit in

this chair and then --

>> TRACY HINCK: One of those two-color cloaks, I'll switch it quickly.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: When we do the consultation, it would be great to have both Tracy and Jen there as the vision of -- and someone represent -- because we can put those players together pre the meeting. The gen ed in the consultation is really key, here is what I'm seeing in class, here's what my concerns are, how will we incorporate that in the new plan.

I think often in students with low incidents disabilities, classroom teachers are like, oh, can you come to this meeting, it's at 1:00. Rather than, if this is our standard of practice, we want the gen ed teacher involved in the consultation and I think that would be important to model.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, great. So Jen and Tracy, are you willing to draft something in the next week or two and either email it to our group or post it to our Google Drive? Our next meeting is March 8th. We want to have something to react to on the March 8th meeting.

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm a little concerned about March 8th. We're going to be at the EDI conference. I don't think I put that I could attend that date.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> TRACY HINCK: So I would try to fit it in, but we're touring a Deaf center based school on that Wednesday morning and I would just hate to miss that. We're going to be in Ohio.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> TRACY HINCK: Is there a way we can change that date, do you think?

>> SHARON HENRY: We can try.

>> TRACY HINCK: We could do later in the day.

>> SHARON HENRY: Let's shoot for later in the day.

>> TRACY HINCK: Okay. In the afternoon.

>> SHARON HENRY: We'll go for later in the day on March 8th.

>> TRACY HINCK: Sorry about that.

>> SHARON HENRY: I forgot that you were away. Okay. But nonetheless, as long as we can come up with -- does that time framework for the two of you to draft something and get it to our group?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yes. We'll do it.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, thank you to you both.

>> TRACY HINCK: Sherry, maybe we can draft something and run it by you, I feel like you're really setting the standard as a special director and superintendent, what this is going to look like. Maybe Jen and I can draft something and scoot it over to you for a quick review, is that okay?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Maybe we can have a premeeting.

[Laughter]

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I have a template, we've got a standard of practice for all IEP meetings, maybe if I sent you that, and you can add on to it. Would that be helpful?

>> Translator: That would be great.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Here's how you say parental rights, because we really wanted to standardize our practice to make sure every IEP meeting feels -- because parents then predict, oh, they're going to start -- the more routinized IEP meetings become, the more safe our parents feel, and teachers.

Jen, I will find it and send it your way, even right now.

>> TRACY HINCK: That would be great. I have one from New Hampshire and from California, but it would nice to have a Vermont one.

>> SHARON HENRY: That would be great. Thank you to the three of you working together on that and getting something back to our group so we can review it on March 8th. I will look for a later time on the 8th. Or maybe even the 7th -- no, does that help you at all, Tracy, if we go a day earlier?

>> TRACY HINCK: It would be easier on the 7th because I could probably fit it in between classes for the conference. But the 8th, I'm going to be traveling around in Ohio.

>> SHARON HENRY: And I'm flying on the 9th so I'm not available on the 9th. But I'm not exactly critical to this level of discussion. So if --

>> TRACY HINCK: Yes, you are. Yes, you are, don't you think that at all.

>> SHARON HENRY: One thing, I will volunteer to work with Linda with planning the July conference, so Linda, you and I can kibitz about that. Go ahead, Linda.

>> LINDA HAZARD: Sorry. Tracy, I don't think the 7th will work because things are so, like, tight.

>> TRACY HINCK: Okay.

>> LINDA HAZARD: Monday and Tuesday are tight, and Wednesday you're traveling. Sharon, if there's any way to avoid the 6th, 7th, and 8th.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. I will maybe try the 10th then or something like that. Okay. So we have a small subgroup doing the scenarios and the templates. And Rebecca and Amelia, we will look to your input once the draft is shared with the group, so that we can make sure that we have all perspectives represented.

And Cassie, if you have time, I realize you're pressed to the max, but if you have time to react and provide input, that would be super. And then I'll work with Linda on planning the July conference, and Linda, and you I can connect offline about that.

So any other comments on the proposal? I will finish it up. I will make the changes. I will get it to Sherry. She'll submit it. Once I make the changes, I'll share it with Spencer and get his input. Then Sherry will submit it next week, on the 16th I think it is.

And then that little piece will be done. The other thing is that just

yesterday, Cassie shared with us some of the feedback that she has collated so far from various stakeholders. We're still waiting on two others. So once we get the two other stakeholders, it's Hands and Voices and I forget the name of the other one, we'll share all that feedback with you and decide -- VCSEA -- and share that feedback with you and then we can have a small subgroup that would work on any revisions that are needed based on actionable steps from that feedback.

And some of it is I think probably going to be more editorial, like one time we said IEP and 504 but we've got to say EST. And there's other perhaps more substantial feedback that we would want to consider.

When we present the tool on May 18th, we want to make sure the tool reflects that feedback and any feedback that Linda is collecting at the national level. The contact that Jen and I had at the Kansas State Deaf Center seems to have evaporated (Joan Macy).

We'll continue to solicit feedback from Cheryl DeConde Johnson. She asked to be kept apprised of our progress. Cassie is anticipating the feedback from the other two vendors by the end of the month. So we'll get that to you in advance of the March 8th meeting.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I am meeting with VCSEA tomorrow, to get their feedback, so that's scheduled. Hands and Voices, we're waiting to hear back from them. Amelia left a comment in here on where they're at, hosting an informational meeting.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, I saw that, I was just going to bring that up in terms of feedback. Do you know the date, Amelia, of that informational meeting? As a parent, I haven't gotten --

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: No, nothing has been set up yet. I think there was a lot of confusion, they were thinking they have to get parents' input to get feedback on the tool. I was like, no, I think just the board can give feedback on the tool and then we can do informational nights.

I think there was some confusion about what the ask was of the Hands and Voices board.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I apologize, that might have been me, I'm sorry. I left it open for them.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Right, are they looking for input from just the Hands and Voices board or just the family, community, so I think there was a little bit of confusion around that that we've been discussing.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I'll touch base with Michelle John, and get a timeline. We want to share the most up to date tool with the group for the May meeting. Sherry, is there a deadline by which documents have to be submitted? We can make changes up until May 17th, that always makes me happy. As a presenter.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Two parts of my brain. I put the draft agenda, again, this is not perfect, gives you something to work from in terms of format. It's what we use as a template for annual review meetings in our district. I have not heard about that.

Usually it's up until a week, they want to be able to put our slide show on their have been slide deck on the website. At some point they'll want to see what our slide deck looks like.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, so we have plenty of time to fiddle and play. Jen and then Cassie both have their hands up.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is a little bit off, but I just wanted to share that when you were mentioning Hands and Voices, that Michelle John just let me know that they are going to be sort of reshowing the four-part seminar that was done in the fall.

So if you know of anybody that didn't, you know, watch it or is interested in learning more about the optimizing outcomes for Deaf and Hard of Hearing, then definitely share it. I can put the URL for registration in the chat if people are interested.



I figured we should share it. I was thinking we could share it -- I think, Sharon, you had mentioned if people want to learn more about the guidelines. But then I realized that they will have already started. But if people want to share that.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, that's a good idea. Linda and I can talk about that for the July meeting as well. It could maybe be some prework, if they wanted to really dig deep.

Cassie, you had a comment or question?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I had my hand up, I might have misunderstood about the wrong draft being sent, I wanted to clarify I did send the most current draft, I believe you guys have the most current draft, right, Amelia?

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Yes.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I wanted to make sure, I may have misheard that.

>> SHARON HENRY: I will send out a doodle link about our next meeting.

Linda, did you want to say anything about your work with the two school districts who are interested in learning about/using the tool? We have a few extra minutes here before we close up.

>> LINDA HAZARD: Probably not at this point, Sharon. I'll have more updates shortly, though.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, great, all right. So is the action plan clear? Everyone knows what they're doing and contributing? Thank you all so much. We'll sign off. And we'll all be in touch by email. Any other comments, questions?

All right. Hearing none, we'll end seven minutes early.  
Take care. Thank you all so very much. Bye now.