REALTIME FILE

D/HH/DB Council
The School Age Subcommittee
Tuesday, June 7, 2022

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: Chris, you're sitting in today because I believe Jacqui had another commitment today. Is that right?

>> CHRIS CASE: Yes. She's at a conference so I'm pinch hitting.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you so much. So we'll get started. Tracy Hinck is going to join as well from the road. She is traveling to a new consult, so she'll be mostly listening in. But she'll have a hard time actually commenting. Any comments she has she'll send me by email or chime in by on the draft. So Sherry, can you bring up the draft. So did Jacqui share with you the agenda, Chris?

>> CHRIS CASE: She probably did at some point, but I don't remember. I'll look for it. I'm sorry. I want to say no, but I'm sure it's somewhere buried in my inbox.

>> SHARON HENRY: Well, having you here is actually double plus for us, because we're going to talk about some of our recommendations and how to frame them and how to frame the cover letter and how do we -- with this work. It's actually great that you're here. And just as a reminder for the group, when you're not speaking, if you could mute your video so the interpreters and people using interpretation can just focus on the one face. And also keep your mic muted unless you're speaking.

Sherry, I'll ask you to pull up the document that we want to talk about. So we're going to spend 20 minutes talking about the cover letter and some specific questions. And then talk about the recommendations and how to frame them.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Which document would you like first, Sharon?

>> SHARON HENRY: The draft of the letter of our report.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Just give me a minute. There's only so many documents I can have at one time up.

>> SHARON HENRY: I know. While Sherry is doing that, Rebecca is going to be joining late. She was on another Zoom call. We all live in Zoom land these days. She'll

hop on when she's ready. So you all got the draft of the -- of our report. And you notice that the to and the from are blank. So maybe Chris, you can help us fill in who the "to" should go to at the agency. Is it you? Is it Jacqui? So that we can continue to collaborate together and move this work forward. That was one of our first questions that we're going to bring up.

>> CHRIS CASE: And I don't know how often to show my camera, Sharon. Should I be showing every time I'm talking?

>> SHARON HENRY: It can become cumbersome.

>> CHRIS CASE: Yeah. But yeah, I think the "to" would be Dan French. And I think you could add me and Jacqui as copies.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Thank you so much. I think the report will probably come from the Council and indicate it's the School Age Subcommittee emailing back and forth with Spencer about that as well. So thank you. And I'll let Sherry get that in there. And my memory is foggy, so I need people who are maybe younger than I am to remember what year it was that the Austine School actually closed. Was it 2014?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: 2014, yes. So that is correct. That's good.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Is Laura here? Now I'm having a brain spasm. I know the entire Vermont Center closed in the fall of 2014. And I believe that Austine closed the spring before that. Can you confirm that?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I believe it was October 2014.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. And more recently, Nine East did not apply -- never applied for the AOE grant. And I put Nine East closed. But they're actually offering other kinds of services. So maybe it isn't accurate to say Nine East closed. I'm not sure what to say here. Tracy can't chime in, but maybe Jen you can clarify.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sure.

>> TRACY HINCK: I can -- oh.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I would say they closed the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program. Because they are still providing speech and language services under Nine East. But they are not providing any Deaf and Hard of Hearing services.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sorry. I think I may have cut you off, Tracy.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. Yes, that's what I was going to say. I haven't quite gotten in the car yet. So I'm able to respond.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Thank you, Tracy. Thank you, Jen. Okay. So are there other comments on -- or edits on the first three or four paragraphs before we get to the recommendations? I did post it on our Google Drive, so if you think of other edits, you can always make your edits there as well or your comments. Okay. Not hearing any, let's turn our attention then to the recommendations.

This, again, just for context both for Dawn and for Chris since you haven't

been part of our conversation all along, the recommendations that I have here are -- this entire document is a draft. The Committee took a look at it last week and this week is our time to discuss it. So these drafts -- these recommendations are based on for conversations I had with Chris Case and Jacqui earlier in May, I believe it was, in the middle of May maybe. Trying to reflect the process that as I understood it as it was explained to me that once we send this tool to the agency, we would like to have them engage their stakeholders. Jacqui spoke to this last week, too, and she named some of them and gave an approximate timeline.

But the other thing that I believe we would like to recommend is the tool will be used with the vendor who receives the grant this upcoming cycle so we can do a bit of a beta test. And once the Agency of Education has vetted it and run it through the process and approved it, it would be that version that could then be used in the next grant cycle. Learn from that process, and then continue to collaborate with the Council and develop an implementation plan so we can onboard other school districts, other providers across Vermont. Because our ultimate goal is to elevate the level of service to all children who receive Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind services. Not just the vendors who get the AOE grants. We're looking for a more audacious goal of trying to improve services across the entire state.

And then once the evidences are submitted based on the tool, the recommendation is to engage qualified reviewers to review the evidence that is submitted in order to assess the quality and the impacts of the services and then take any appropriate steps as warranted, indicated, needed, deemed appropriate, I guess. So let me stop there and give you a minute to digest that. And then take comments from the group and edit suggestions. Additions, deletions, et cetera.

(Silence)

And because I'm on a laptop, I don't want -- I can't see everybody all at once, so the raising your hand function doesn't work necessarily very well. So feel free to unmute and turn on your video and go ahead with any comments.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sharon, this is Sherry. Number three by collaborating with Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind Council, develop an implementation plan to onboard school districts. I'm not sure if "onboard" is the right word selection.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. To orient?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Support use of the tool. To inform the school districts of the tool? Maybe inform?

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Other service providers that support the use of a tool. How about inform? Because onboard seems -- and it goes back to what Jacqui was saying. Unless it's in the law, we can't require it.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: But by informing them that -- I think that might be a better choice. But I defer to others.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, okay. I certainly appreciate the nuances and your help there, because I'm not -- I don't float in the education world. This education world, anyway. A couple of comments coming in by chat. Let me just. Okay, yeah. Hi, Lisa. Jen, go ahead.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sorry. This is Jen. And I don't know if we have this answer, but I'm thinking sort of past that. After it's been reviewed and take appropriate steps, is there a thought about who will monitor or re-evaluate to see if there have been improvements or changes made? I'm just thinking past that if there's any thoughts about that.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's a great question, Jen. Thank you. That's one thing that's out there. And I think the other thing that that leads to is what's the periodicity of the evaluation. Is it every ten years, every five years, every three years? And then to monitor any -- let's just call them remediation steps that needed to take place. Over what period of time is a vendor given to try and improve its quality? So I think those are things we can learn by trialing the tool the first year and seeing how it goes and then making some of those decisions. But I think what I hear you saying, Jen, there needs to be some thought given to long-term oversight.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Right. That's what I'm -- yeah, I guess that's what I'm thinking. And ultimately, who is responsible for that oversight? Besides obviously the providers need to be -- take the self-initiative to do it. But is there somebody else that is overseeing that? Is the AOE taking that on? Are we asking them to? I guess that's just a big question.

>> SHARON HENRY: Uh-huh, yeah. I don't know. And Chris, feel free to chime in here. I think in our initial conversations through the collaboration, it might be some sort of shared responsibility.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry. I think it would be -- I'm sorry, Chris. My experience has been start with a phase one. Let's see the success or the process of phase one. Then I think it's the pivot point. Is it back to the legislation or AOE? But I think if we get too far ahead of ourselves, then we can risk jeopardizing the work that's been done thus far. So I would say take our time. Let's have a successful tool. And then we have something to offer whether we go back to the legislation or to AOE would be my recommendation.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Sherry. Chris, did you have a comment?

>> CHRIS CASE: Yeah. I was thinking of how to frame the recommendations here. You could do a recommendation around having the AOE articulate a plan for moderating the assessment tool. And that I think would include information about who was doing the monitoring and also to discuss how it might be effective or not effective in

the field. I'm trying to think of ways to represent some of Jen's questions at this stage without giving -- and I don't know if you'd want to get into a lot of specific more prescriptive recommendations. But in the way you have for number one, you know, I think that's a more generalized kind of recommendation and incorporates stakeholder groups.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, okay. (Coughs). So we can have something general there. So go slow and do it well and learn. And then take baby steps forward. But keep on moving it forward. Okay. Other comments from the group? All right. Does anyone think there should be representations here that aren't represented?

(Silence)

I can't believe the draft is that good. (Laughs). There must be ways to improve it.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sharon, it is excellent. So I think you're hearing from us. We really support this work.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is one time I don't like silence. (Laughs). Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think it's also the time of the year. I've had several meetings recently where it just seems like people are like -- quiet.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right, right. I hear you on that. So as you continue to mull this over. Again, this is posted on our Google Drive. So if you think of other comments tomorrow or the next day, jump on there and just type them into the document. And I will incorporate them.

So with the cover letter and the recommendations discussed, now the next couple pages just describe overall our process, what we've been doing for the last -- since February or thereabouts. A discussion of our members, who our key stakeholders have been. I don't think I missed anybody. I went through all of our minutes to try to capture everyone with whom we have exchanged. Fairly extensive list both locally as well as nationally.

I didn't list of dates of our meetings, but we actually have met nine or ten times. And we have posted all of our meeting minutes thanks to Laura to the DAIL website. And then I described the -- how we went about developing the tool through our collaborative process, our national search for metrics, and other benchmarks. Ultimately landing on the NASDSE tool.

And then I describe how we turn to the Agency of Education where they use education quality standards to describe what a high-quality education should look like. And so basically our tool mimics or mirrors that tool in terms of process. So the quality indicators describe and then we brainstormed our ideas about what the evidence could look like. And so it will be the vendor who submits that evidence in support of their achievement of that particular quality indicator.

So here, Sherry, I think we can delete the recommendations. I like the

recommendations on the cover letter in case no one makes it this far because everyone is so busy. So if people are in agreement with that, we'll take them out there. And we would paste our quality indicator tool right in here.

Throughout our documents I changed it to the Vermont Quality Indicator Tool for Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind Services. If someone has a better name that they like, that ends up having a snappy acronym, shoot me an email or a text. I can pop it in there. But that's the best I could do right now. Is there anything missing from our process that you thought that I should -- that should be reflected in report? Copy of this report will go to the AOE and another copy will go to the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind Council.

(Silence)

Did I miss any major pieces of our process?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I don't think so.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Great.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think it's really thorough and not overdoing it. I think it's the right balance.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. Didn't want to kill everybody with the detail but I wanted to reflect the enormous amount of work you all have put into this and the great collaborative effort that we had across, you know, we all represent very different aspects of this work and everyone pretty much brought their full selves to the table. So it's been good.

Okay. Well, if there's nothing else, then let's close this document and turn to the scoring rubric. I sent you an updated copy of it. And basically what I did was to -- rather than using a 0, 1, 2, 3. I changed it to a 1, 2, 3, 4. So what we can spend the next 15 minutes or so talking about is the anchor points. So the language here really makes a difference. Because you're trying to convey something to a reviewer who's then going to use that guidance to interpret the evidence that's submitted.

So again, if we think of a 1 as being the vendor meets 0% to 25% of the evidence of the quality indicator. A 2, 25% to 50%. And then 50% to 75%. And a 4 is 75% to 100% of the evidence. What words would you change here to reflect that -- those bins, if you will. Those demarcations.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sharon, this is Sherry. I liked how you put 0% to 25%. I would include that in parentheses at the end. It shows the band. I can do that if you'd like.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sure. Go right ahead, yeah. And I think by putting it there, having been a reviewer for lots of things, grants, accreditation, this sort of quality indicator work in the past in my other life, some people have a hard time putting a zero or a one down. But when you say it's really representing a bandwidth or a segment, then it gives people a little bit more comfort.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. So is -- for some of these indicators that really include a lot of different things that the provider needs to show they're doing, we tried to consolidate a lot of them. My only concern is is it going to be so broad that there are going to be a lot of these? Maybe that just is what it is. That are going to be in the two or three range or something? Is there a place to put notes or make comments about why they're not meeting? Or is that not included here?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, no. There can be a column to add notes. Because -- and that was the other part of the discussion that in some tools, the reviewer also gets to indicate that there's so much lacking here this needs to be a priority. That was the other question I had for the group. Should we add a column where this indicator needs to be addressed ASAP. So yes. There's room for both of those things, Jen.

And of course we have -- I believe it's nine quality indicators in all. So I didn't want to get into the weeds with you, but sometimes what can happen is you can sum the ones, twos, threes, and fours and come up with a numerical score overall, or you can say well quality indicator number seven is so important, we're going to weight that indicator more. So it didn't a simple sum. It's a weighted sum. That's a decision that's probably more down in the weeds. But I've seen that done as well.

So let's take this example that Sherry is showing us, it's a great one. (Coughs). In my humble opinion, the first quality indicator, the licensure indicator is priority. So you can just rate that as a one, two, three, or four. But when you're summing it overall, I would weight this one more. Because if you don't have qualified providers, then the rest of the program kind of falls apart. So that's one example. So I would vote for adding a priority column. As a reviewer, if this was deficient, I would have checked this is a priority and needs attention right away.

So what could happen is if we like this format, I wouldn't do this now. I would just submit the scoring rubric and then once it's been vetted, the quality indicator tool could -- the format could be changed to look like this very easily. But there's no use to do it now unless everybody agrees on the anchoring of the wording points and the tool itself.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry. I like the wording. I like the justification. I think, again, it needs to be baited before we start overweighting others over some. I think that's another level of work. But I think this is a great place to start.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Thank you, Sherry. Other comments from the group? Does this language -- if you were the reviewer, could you use this language (coughs) to help evaluate this evidence that's going to be submitted? Could you envision yourself doing that?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry. I absolutely could. I think you've made it very easy to make that clarity.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I agree, totally. I think it looks great. And I did

like it having the priority column. I do think that that would be helpful.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. Then I will add that in. Great, thank you. Okay. So Rebecca agrees looking good and agrees with a column for adding notes. So I can do that, absolutely. Welcome, Rebecca. I'm glad you're here. I'm sorry you're spending your morning in Zoomland too.

Okay. Nothing else here, then we can -- yeah. Bring us all back together. Jen, it's a little bit late in the game because we kept on pushing you off, but was there anything else from the Colorado document that would be helpful to us? In terms or either evidence or aspects they considered with respect to it that we have not?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Honestly, no. I don't really think so. I reviewed it a little bit again this morning. And I don't really think so. Theirs was more of a gap analysis and then coming up with some recommendations from their findings. So I don't think it's going to add a lot to what we're focusing on, to be honest.

>> SHARON HENRY: I know one of our parking lot items is to go back and -- Jen you and I can debrief from the conversation with Rick, because he gave us a lot of other things to sink our teeth into. But it wasn't necessarily related to assessment. So we can circle back to that at some point when we're feeling more rested. Okay.

The other stakeholder feedback that we had received. One was have a student who had gone through the system birth to 22 and is now a graduate student. So I had sent her the summary of the ten principles from the NASDSE guideline and asked her to reflect on each of them and how services in Vermont had served or not served her well over the last 20-some-odd years. And as you saw from the summary of my notes, it really all came down to -- or a large part of it came down to having qualified reviewers, qualified ASL interpreters, and how critical that was to her success. And being willing to come to class. To participate in the social aspects that occurs before and after class. And then the other key thing that she emphasized was in her middle school years she joined a co-op where after school several days a week, she went and hung out with a family who had -- I'm not sure how many -- but several Deaf members. So she was immersed in ASL at a very important and formative part of her development. She said that was just amazing.

So I'm preaching to the choir here, but her experience really speaks to the work that we've done in the appendices in terms of having ways for qualified ASL interpreters to be hired and screened. And then the need to increase those opportunities for children to have access to their mode of language in a more robust kind of way. So her feedback echoes what the NASDSE guidelines and you know anyway. Any questions about that?

(Silence)

Okay. And then the other person who sent in information was Cassie Santos. It was someone who Jacqui liaised with. We had a hard time getting access to her

comments. But in the last Word document Jacqui sent, I skimmed through her comments and most of them were very supportive. Great work, we need this. A couple things but nothing that is a show stopper, so it's nice to have her support as well.

>> CHRIS CASE: Just to interject on this, Cassie is the person that's taking over Alex's position. She's our new hire. She's starting on July 5th with us. She'll be liaising with the Council as part of her work.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, that's great. I didn't know that. That's wonderful. And what's her background, Chris?

>> CHRIS CASE: Her background is in a mix of teacher leadership and classroom practitioner work as a special educator with disability populations I believe her current employer is Milburn School District.

>> SHARON HENRY: Wonderful. We'll look forward to welcoming her to the Council. It's great she's reviewed this document, so she'll be up to speed on it quite quickly. Okay. So the next piece of work is one last look at our appendices. Sherry, if you could take a minute to pull up that -- it's actually in the agenda that I sent out by email. So this will be the appendices I can copy and paste into our report.

So thank you, all, for sending me the links. Jen, I did get your email this morning. I haven't had a chance to try it yet. But I'll get that endorsement link popped into the document. Are you there, Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yes. Do you want me to go to the email? Those appendices?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. That's easier. Either the email or the draft report. It's a copy and paste. So whichever is easiest.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How's that?

>> SHARON HENRY: Perfect. That's great. That's great. So this is our final list. The communication language plan, the Vermont copy is with the AOE right now so it's not in its final version, so we can't copy it in here just yet. What I can do is copy in the link to the New Jersey communication plan upon which the Vermont plan is based. And then say the Vermont version is coming and we'll share it when it's available. That's what Jen had suggested.

Tracy sent me the links from the American Academy of Audiology both for selection fitting and verification as well as audio distribution systems and selection and verification for the classroom setting. The template for classroom observations to ensure access. There's a national agreed upon assessment tool called the ATCAT that allows providers to sort of run down a checklist and observe the student's behavior in the classroom. So it's a more standardized format.

The template for functional evaluation in the classroom, Tracy shared that link with me. That's a life link. Then we wanted to have our definitions of qualified providers. Jen has sent me the link for the TODHH. I will paste that in there. Provides can also

working through the AOE do a transcript review work sheet. That is there.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sharon? Sorry, this is Jen. I'm just -- do you think that that transcript review needs to be there? Or is the TOD endorsement information enough? Because they're really --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yeah, I would agree with Jen. I don't think we want to -- again, I think that's one way that people are working around with the professional development. I wouldn't reinforce that. I think just the TODHH is fine.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: Absolutely. I would defer to you, Jen.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. I would say just have the link to the TOD endorsement information and leave it at that. Because -- and there are other ways to get to that, but I would not get in the weeds. I would just leave it as the endorsement.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Wonderful. So I will take off that piece. And the audiologist both from the OPR here in Vermont and ASHA the American Speech and Hearing Association. The speech language pathology AOE, OPR, and ASHA links are there.

And then for the interpreters, as I listened to the conversation last week, I thought I heard a number of different ASL proficiency tools are available. My question to the group is should we list them all? In case, I can find the links for the ASLPI and CILPI. So let me ask that question first. Should we have all of these opportunities here? Or just do you have favorites? Ones that are better than the other? What does the group think? Laura?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Yeah. So I was thinking -- I mean, this is -- correct me if I'm wrong. But what I'm thinking is out of the ones currently listed, those five, number two and number three the ASLPI and the SCPI. I think those are more for communication facilitators, not interpreters. So those two would not apply. I believe.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Does everyone agree with Laura? We can move number two and number three down below to where we need to define the minimum qualifications for communication facilitator.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes. I would agree. Yes. I would agree.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I just need to make a note that I'm going to move number two and number three down to communication facilitator. So then we're happen we with one were four, and five to stay underneath the ASL proficiency tests. So I have that correct?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I'm just wondering if you need that first bullet. Because they're not taking -- if you can just say the BEI or the EIPA or the NIC certification, like the national certification -- I don't know that you need anything else under that. Because like you -- I guess I'm not -- has ASL proficiency test and then educational interpreters. I think it should be one bullet. Educational interpreter.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Does that make sense?

>> SHARON HENRY: It does, okay. Thank you for that guidance. I wasn't sure if there were a number of proficiency tests that could be done and any one of them depending on the score would qualify as an education interpreter. This is not my world, so I don't know. Okay. So I can move one and four and five underneath educational interpreter. And eliminate that first bullet all together, right?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: One, four, and five. Yes. What is that where it says more information can be found here on number six? Is that the link to --

>> SHARON HENRY: I think it is. Yeah. That's what you had sent to me. I can eliminate that as well. And a question from a -- again, somebody who's outside the field. The registry of interpreters for the Deaf. If I click on that link, it brings me to a general information page. Is that the page where I go where I want to find interpreters in Vermont?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: This is Laura, yeah. Yeah, I'm just wondering if I'm looking through that list. There should be maybe an order what is best for those three options. Like the best -- like EIPA I think should be first. And if you have have, you know, those other two under there, you can add links to them. Maybe the EIPA, you can ad a link to that page. And then for the second one -- I don't remember what I said last meeting about the BEI if we want to -- for as a state what we wanted to do. I think last time we were discussing -- what was that on Friday? How we could approach the BEI in regards to that. Related to monitoring the test or or if you wanted to have someone take the BEI and then.

>> INTERPRETER: Interpreter is going to clarify.

   (Silence).

>> LAURA SIEGEL: So as an interpreter, they can take the BEI and see if the state -- as the state of Vermont we could include the RID certification or the BEI.

>> INTERPRETER: Just to clarify, yes we're in the talks -- the state changed the contract so that BEI is one of the allowed credentials for interpreters. It's not yet for educational interpreters. So there is a meeting coming up to talk about whether Vermont will actually post the testing site for BEI. So that's still in the works.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Okay. Thank you, Laura.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sharon, this is Jen. I'm wondering if we need to do -- I want to make sure we get this right. I would like to talk maybe a little bit more to you, Elizabeth, about the national certification and where things stand with that. Because in the past we had either the EIPA or other certification was acceptable. And the BEI is new and nothing is set in stone about that. But I want to be sure we are clear what -- so maybe the BEI should not be included there until it is confirmed as it's even a possibility of taking place here in Vermont.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's --

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I also saw Amelia's note. I just wanted to make sure I was understanding what you're saying. So are you saying because it says up to age 22. Are you saying that ASL interpreter could be -- because this is up to age 22 because it's for kids receiving their education up to that age. You know, some stay in special ed.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Right. So this is Amelia. That was my question to throw out there. I was wondering in this age group is there a population that would use an ASL interpreter opposed to an educational interpreter or communication facilitator. I didn't know the answer to the question, That's Why I was throwing it out there.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Truth be told, educational interpreter is just something that's used for people working in the education field. And education is really, you know, really what it is.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Yeah, no. That's fine. That's fine. I just wanted to make sure we included because I know the NASDSE guidelines refers to the ASL interpreters. I wanted to make sure that we covered everything. Especially when we talk about community work and meeting up with Deaf community and all that kind of stuff. I just wanted to make sure we have everything covered.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I agree. I'm just -- I agree. I don't know if we should or not. Should we do ASL/educational interpreter? I think for the document we just used educational interpreter.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's true, Jen. We have to defer to you as the professional here. Keeping it educational interpreter keeps the standard high and consistent, let's keep it that way.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Okay. That's what I would vote for. And Rebecca, I see your note. Not sure but should add Vancro. I'm not sure what you mean there. Add it where?

>> REBECCA LALANNE: So I'm not sure if we wanted to add Vancro, because they are responsible for interpreting services. And so I'm involved with that program, so they do have a connection with four different school districts already. And interpreters for those school districts. So might be another accessibility resource that we could add that would have certified, qualified interpreters for districts. I'm not sure we could add that into the document or not. Oh, Vancro screening, yeah I guess something like that. Vancro has interpreters who are certified. They have background checks, that sort of thing. Where we could put that or include that, I'm not sure.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. So this is Sharon. So I think -- I'm hearing some great feedback in terms of how to clean up this bullet. So we have educational interpreter and just a couple of the proficiency tests. Adding Vancro. And for my own clarification, national certification is done by RID?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, okay. Great. So I will clean that one up. And I will run it by you, Jen. To make sure I have it correct. Or I'll run it by the group. And then my next question is down on communication facilitator. The minimum qualifications are to have done the ASLPI and the SCPI, one or the other. Are there minimum scores that are recommended?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: There is not a minimum currently. It's an educational team decision and it's based on the student's needs. This is how it is currently written. This is the one area that's more gray. Which makes it difficult.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Where would you like to see the standard be? Or as a professional. And where is it going nationally?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Nationally, there -- I would say there's not a national standard for communication facilitators because they're called all different kinds of things. Some other places to call them communication facilitator. Some call them language facilitator. Some call them sign facilitator. There's different things that they're called. And I think that this is just an area that I think will continue to be discussed if this is -- when we talked about having this role because it's been around for a while, we don't want to dismiss individuals that have strong language skills and are able to model strong language for students but who are not necessarily interpreters depending on the student's needs and how they are educated.

So that is where I think -- I mean, I would say I would hope for a minimum level of a three. Because it's on a rank of one through five.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: As it is right now in the job description, there is not a minimum. The level should match, you know -- be a good match for the student's needs or something.

>> SHARON HENRY: In the in judgment of the team.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. That's a slippery slope.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes, I -- yes. I agree.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: It's a very, very, very slippery slope.

>> SHARON HENRY: And I could see where there was the point about for children who are developing their language skills, you want the highest qualified strong -- someone with really strong language skills. Okay. All right. So to sum up this portion, I will make those corrections. I will share it with the group just to make sure I got it right. Any other comments on that bullet before we move to the next one?

(Silence)

Okay. We had a robust discussion about the reviewers to review the evidence that's submitted. I think I reflected all the professional titles that were mentioned. And if I missed any, please let me know. Then we discussed the evaluation scale. So we're

good on that. The other outstanding business is at one point we had talked about including in our appendices a list of reliable, valid tools for assessing children. We never discussed it and at this point I think it might be a little bit of a stretch to try and do that. But how are people feeling?

(Silence)

It really comes down to Jen and Tracy. You're the ones in the field who are using these tools. And it could be that we add them in the next iteration and --

>> JEN BOSTWICK: That list you shared and I don't know if Tracy's on or not, but she's definitely got a ton of experience with -- (inaudible) -- but that is a very, it's a robust list.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: It is not a do all of these. If you're looking at expressive language skills, these are a list of some high-quality assessments to choose from. It's not do this one -- you know, it's definitely not a recipe for what to do. It's a long list of these are high-quality tests that are appropriate to use with our population.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right, right. It might be something that's better done in a professional group. You know? With all the professionals at the table opposed to in a document like this.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Oh, I see what you're saying.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry. I would agree. I think that we're getting into waters that are beyond. And even though I know Jen and Tracy have deep expertise, whether this document should be the place where we outline, here are the different assessment tools. May be a stretch.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. Okay. All right. So if we take that off, then this list represents our appendices that will be attached to the report. I'll make the corrections we added today and add a couple of links that arrived in my inbox this morning. And we'll be good to go. Are we -- I don't think we're missing anything, are we? I think in order to complete the assessment work, I think we have a pretty complete list of appendices to help providers and decision makers to do that work.

The last thing on our agenda was the quality indicator tool. And my question really was for Sherry. Can you just take a minute to pull it up? I had a question about the intro portion. And while Sherry's doing that, were there any other edits or thoughts about the quality indicator tool? I'm sure you didn't read it over the weekend. But as we're bringing this work to a close, I just want to make sure I capture everyone's last thoughts here.

So Sherry, you had mentioned -- don't go up any higher. So we have the scope and the purpose. We have an introduction. And thank you, Chris. I appreciate your time. We'll be in touch. Have a great day. What definition, Sherry, do you think would be appropriate here? Or is this category even appropriate?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think we can remove that. This is Sherry. That was from when we first started. And now that you have all the definitions and the appendices, I think you're fine.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Maybe there's a statement here that in the appendices you will find -- and you can list out what's included.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Other than that, I think we're good.

>> SHARON HENRY: Maybe just change definitions and put appendices there and that will remind me to ad that statement in. But I think -- I like having a simple intro here and not keeping it -- keeping it short so people can get to the meat of the matter which is the tool itself.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry. I'd agree.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, great. All right. So I think that is it. I don't think there are any other comments here. I quickly checked. I'll go through and take out all the highlighting and that sort of stuff. And I will go through and make sure everything is D/HH/DB. I think that's where we agreed in terms of the proper abbreviation. Any other last-minute thoughts about this?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I just want to say -- this is Sherry -- what an impressive body of work. I never thought we were ever going to accomplish all of this in such a short amount of time. But it just speaks to the quality of the people we brought to the table. So thank you, everybody. I'm very impressed.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, yeah. And you can stop sharing your screen. I want to echo that, too, and say, boy. If there's ever a subcommittee you want to cochair, this is it. It was a pleasure to work with all of you and have you all participate so incredibly fully. And get all this work done amongst busy schedules, demanding schedules. And really, really important work that I think is going to hopefully make a difference.

So the process going forward is I will touch up the cover letter. Send it off to the AOE, send the copy -- the report to the Council. The Council meets July 15th or 19th, somewhere around in there. And many of you are Council members, so you'll obviously get to see it there. And then as Jacqui described, the process at the AOE in terms of stakeholder review is anywhere from six to eight weeks. So it'll be over the summer and into the fall. But I'm kind of hoping that this subcommittee doesn't disband. And that we'll be willing to come back together as needed in the fall or maybe if you're available in the summer if there's a question or something. I'm not sure who's on appointment or off appointment during the summertime. But this is just the first step. We want to see this all the way through.

Other comments from the group?

(Silence).

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen again, sorry. I feel like I'm talking a lot. Can -- are we able to share this with folks now? Or not?

>> SHARON HENRY: I think just give me a week. I'm theoretically away on vacation last week and this week. So give me a week to get home and clean up the document and finish it. And then I will send an email out to all of you that it's as polished as I can make it. And then I think it's good to go, Jen. Yeah.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Okay. Thanks.

>> SHARON HENRY: Did you have someone in mind?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: No, I'm just -- we're meeting as a group, our staff, and so I was -- I wanted to -- there was one of the things that we were going to share that we've been working on this year and I just didn't -- if folks asked to see it, I didn't know if we were able to share. We're meeting on the 20th.

>> SHARON HENRY: June 20th?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, yeah. It'll be ready by then. I'll get back on Saturday. You'll have it by then. Yeah. All right. Well, we're finishing our last meeting early. That's pretty amazing. We are an amazing group. So thank you, all. I'll be in touch by email. And have a great afternoon.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Thank you so much.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Sharon?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, Lisa?

>> LISA JOHNSON: Sorry. I'm trying to turn my video on. You had mentioned last week -- I'm sorry. Are we recording? I don't know if you have to interpret, Emily. You had mentioned last week or last time we met about a Ph.D. program that you knew about?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes. If you send me an email (coughs) I can forward to you an email that there's a Ph.D. program that is in -- under review being put forward by The College of Educational Social Sciences develop leaders in education. So it is not being offered now. I think they're hoping to begin -- if it gets approved and makes it all the way through, they're hoping to enroll students. I don't know if it was the fall of '23 or fall of '24.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Super. Okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: Email me. And I'll put my email in the chat to you.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Thank you. You might have done that already. My 25-year-old son was suddenly diagnosed with melanoma, and he's fine now. He's already had the surgery to remove it. But it kind of sidelined my entire life for two weeks.

>> SHARON HENRY: Uh-huh. I'm sorry to hear that.

>> LISA JOHNSON: He's doing great. But if I said I would follow up earlier, I'm sorry if I didn't.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, no, no, no. That's okay. That's okay. Rebecca, I'm so glad that you joined our subcommittee. And I hope that you are able to have the time to stay with us through the summer and into the fall. Because I know you're pulled in a million directions. But your input was invaluable and the stakeholders you brought to the table were helpful to informing our work. So thank you so much.

(Silence).

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Awesome. Thank you so much. It's such worthwhile work and thank you for all you've been doing. Thanks, everybody.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yep. Okay. All right, everyone. I'm going to sign off. I'll see you later.

[Concluded at 1:05 p.m. ET]