

## REALTIME FILE

D/HH/DB Council  
The School Age Subcommittee  
Monday, May 9, 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 realtime file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \* \*

>> SHARON HENRY: So we're going to start our meeting. Welcome, everyone. The same way we conducted ourselves last week, if you're not speaking, please turn your video off and mute your microphone. And I'm going to turn it over to Rebecca to introduce Stuart and then Sherry is going to lead us through a discussion of quality indicators five through eight, hopefully. Depending on what sort of progress we make. And Jen will be joining us a bit late. She already let me know that. And Amelia is not available today, because she's taking care of Natalie.

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Hi, hi, hi. Here I am. So sorry about that. So yes, I'll be introducing Stuart. He works for per diem. It's a great opportunity for him to kind of see what the community -- what this committee is doing, what his experience has been, how he can benefit. What it's like to be Deaf and involved in this.

So we're very excited to have him join us today. Thank you, Stuart, for coming.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Rebecca. And now Sherry, I'll turn it over to you to lead our discussion on the revisions of quality indicator number five. And Stuart, the way we have been working this is if you have a comment or some feedback, please raise your hand by pressing on the little icon. Or putting your question in the chat and I will try to monitor the chat while Sherry is managing the edits and leading the discussion.

>> INTERPRETER: You're muted, Sherry.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: There we go. Thank you so much. So many of you may know the original chair of the Subcommittee School Age was Stuart. We're happy to

take over. That's how Sherry and I got into the position we're in now. It's great to have him back at the table.

So what I've done over the -- since our last meeting was to make the edits based on feedback we received. And so you'll see a cleaner version of the document where we have changed to program indicators. We have come up with our essential elements for quality in section one. And this is what we have in place based on last week's feedback.

Here is expectations two. You'll note what is in yellow is what we want to have as appendix in terms of providing more detailed information. For example, here, leading what we can examine as data-driven or evidence-based practices. That will be a live link. Excuse me.

Here is number three. And it's really limiting the information that we had as compared to the NASDSE information. Number four we walked through. And now that's cleaned up. And again, the reason communication plan was highlighted again, we'd like that to be a live link. That's a new piece of work happening in Vermont, and we want to provide more detailed information about in this assessment tool.

And so now we're at number five. And this is Sharon's group. I don't know, Sharon, if you wanted to walk through your changes. Or do you want me to facilitate that conversation?

>> SHARON HENRY: How about if you facilitate the conversation, Sherry. And if I can provide clarification, I will.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right, great. Thank you. So number five is student receives individualized specially designed instruction that incorporates evidenced practices. And so in that you'll see that, I think, Sharon's group added qualified providers and they listed Vermont licensed teacher of the Deaf, Vermont licensed audiologist, Vermont licensed SLP, Vermont licensed teachers of the visually impaired. Who determined approach to instruction and assistive technology and monitoring student progress in order to ensure the effective instruction.

And so the program that is being evaluated, their staff would advocate for and document that. And the first point is decisions about programs and strategies that are used with students are guided by recent evidence practices. So that was a citation of recent literature used to guide decisions. Any questions or feedback on that point?

>> SHARON HENRY: So this is Sharon. I would like the providers on the call to be honest about how realistic this is about providing citations of literature. This is what I always have my students aspire to clinically. But I'm not into having providers do unnecessary busy work if it's truly not going to operationalize. So this is Jen's question she wanted me to ask.

(Silence)

Tracy, do you have an opinion?

>> TRACY HINCK: Hi. This is Tracy. I'm not really sure of the question. Is what

actualized?

>> SHARON HENRY: So the evidence that decisions about the programs and strategies is guided by recent literature and recent evidence-based practices. So if the provider is submitting evidence of recent literature used, is that a realistic expectation, or is it going to be just a cut and paste from a five-minute literature search the day before the document is due?

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm wondering if this is something that should be guided by the vendor that's providing the services versus something that's monitored. I don't know. I mean, I certainly think that could be the case. I hope not. As a service provider, I have evidence and -- I have evidence behind everything I do with students. So if anyone were to ask me why I'm doing something, I can reference probably off the top of my head what guidelines I'm using to implement that practice.

Is it something I think is easy to collect? I don't know.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, okay. When Jen does jump on, I'll have her address this question a little bit more. But I think -- but the nugget of what Tracy says is if it's a professional -- a licensed professional who's providing this service and making the decisions, then by nature of licensure, he or she is using recent evidence. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah. This is Tracy Hinck again. If you have a license, you have to maintain CEUs, and so part of that continuing education is staying current. Things change all the time. And so I think that's just another rationale as to why you want to have a TOD, not a general licensed because the CEUs will apply differently.

>> SHARON HENRY: Jen and I had this same conversation on Friday when we were working on writing this. And our goal is to make sure the evidence really reflects practice. So perhaps we could take this back and Jen and I could work on this one a little bit more unless someone sees an easy remedy here. Laura?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I noticed on the list there's specifics about the profession. I'm wondering what about communication facilitator, educational interpreter using -- can you add those? Are those going to be included in there? Will that be required to have some sort of license or certification to prove their skills?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: And also the continuing CEUs for those as well. You know, they need to be held at the same level, the same accountability as other professionals. Teacher of the Deaf, audiologist, interpreter, or communication facilitator or whatever you choose to use. They need to be held to that same level.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, thank you, Laura for that comment. We can add those professional titles to the -- a section up above. And maybe Sherry, you can make a note to do that. And I'd have to have the other professionals on the call address whether or not those titles are -- those professionals are required to do CEUs. I don't know enough about those. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy Hinck. And I think this is a good question for

Jen. But unfortunately -- and Laura, I think we've talked about this too -- there isn't currently a license for interpreters in Vermont. So it would be hard to require a program to have that if there isn't one currently. It's something that I think is being worked on and has been worked on for a long time, but it just doesn't exist in Vermont yet. So it would be hard to list it here.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: So even though there's no license, could we say -- could we recommend that there's maybe some sort of a screening or EIPA which is Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment of having a specific score on that? Or maybe having the ASLPI or the ASLSI we talked about last week. So it's on the resume. They have something to prove some sort of proficiency. Can we make that part of the job requirement? That's just one idea. It's kind of like a recommended -- maybe not required, but recommended to have X, Y, and Z.

>> SHARON HENRY: So this is Sharon. I think if you look in the appendices, Laura, one of the things we have planned on our to-do list is to list out the professionals that are involved in providing these services and begin to document what those requirements are. So I think that is a way to address the question. Sherry has a question. You're muted. You're muted, Sherry.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sorry. So above in one of the earlier elements, it already talks about the use of research and evidence-based practices. So I don't think we need both of these if we're already asking it in a previous bullet. So I think we could delete this bullet.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I think the -- as long as the previous bullet -- which I don't recall off the top of my head -- addresses how the evidence is used in decisions about programming.

(Silence).

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So this is Sherry. This is what we have. Data-driven instruction and evidenced-based practices are in place. Rationale for instructional programs are documented in the team meeting minutes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. And that's under what major heading, Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: That's under expectations.

>> SHARON HENRY: So why did NASDSE want to have it again under number five? What is number five? Specifically about? So if the group feels that it's covered up above and doesn't need to be documented here and that the stem of defining qualified providers makes this strong enough, then I'm fine dropping the bullet. How do other people feel? How do other people feel about dropping this bullet and this evidence? Jacqui, do you have an opinion?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Thanks, Sharon. I couldn't find my mute, unmute, or my hand.

>> SHARON HENRY: It's a challenge every time, isn't it?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. My interpretation of the second bullet is it's

referring to special education. And in the law, special education means specially designed instruction. That is around specialized delivery, content that needs to be modified and adjusted. The supports and services. So when it specifically comes to that SDI or specially designed instruction in special ed, are you using evidence-based practices and interventions? And that is part of the IEP team's decision. You know, developing the program and then what is our approach in delivering that content methodology and delivery of service.

So just clarifying I think that's why NASDSE has that in twice. One seems to be about programming. And the other one seems specific to special ed. I hope that might clarify. But that's just my interpretation.

>> SHARON HENRY: So Jacqui, would you then argue for keeping this bullet in?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Ooh. Well, for those that are receiving specially designed instruction, for those who have IEPs, we know -- we have a broader range of student and student needs than just special ed. But for those who have special education, I think that's an appropriate bullet. Whether it's a citation of recent literature or it's a link to one of the many websites that show evidence-based interventions and instruction that have literature behind it, yeah. I don't think that this is -- I don't know if we're going to get somebody who knows APA or MLA style of citing research literature in that piece. But there are ways that you can include what type of approaches that you're using. Where this group is advocating that the reviewers would also have that information. It's also on that reviewer to be able to look at what is being presented and to do also agree that it is an evidence-based approach that's supported by research and evidence as part of replication studies.

>> SHARON HENRY: So with that argument, then I would say that the point above is for at the program level and this point here is at the student level it's argued that it should be kept in both places. Am I understanding you correctly, Jacqui?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yes. Yeah. Just might be that disclaimer is why NASDSE had specially designed instruction. That's used synonymously with special education.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Thank you so much for that clarification. Appreciate that. Okay, Sherry. Back to you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. This is Sherry. Training is provided to general education teachers, specialized instruction support staff personnel, and others to understand the language, communication, and meeting notes. I'm not sure what that means. It might be important for you -- I'm just reading aloud.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, sure. So the evidence -- the meeting notes are when the teacher of the Deaf Hard of Hearing goes in to educate the classroom on this student's hearing loss, the profile. That's what the meeting notes are. Redacted, of course.

As appropriate and needed implementation of research-based practices

particularly the continuation of foundations for literacy. Again, I wish Jen was here to speak a little bit more to this, but my understanding is that there is very specific situations where this approach should be used and Tracy jump in here if you have anything to add until Jen arrives. The other piece is notes from classroom observations. Again defined above. And reflect they're being incorporated. These are redacted as well. Then the last piece of evidence for this bullet is that qualified providers are maintaining currency in their professional literature by attending continuing ed conferences and maintenance of the Vermont licensure. TODHH, audiology, SLP, and TVI.

So any comments on that bullet? Sherry has her hand raised.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So I'm not sure what -- so I can see meeting notes. You'd have a link to meeting notes. In the implementation of research-based practices particularly continuation, what would I see? What would I link? I'm having a hard time -- I mean, foundations of literacy is a core curriculum for our district. I just don't know what that would look like, what would you link to demonstrate that?

>> SHARON HENRY: I have to admit Jen will have to answer that question. Highlight it, please. It's something she felt very strongly about including. Comments on the last two evidence points. Is the third bullet point redundant in any sort of way? I guess it's when they go in to observe the student in his classroom and what the provider observes. The meeting notes from the first bullet points educates the actual classroom teacher. Here's Jen. I'm going to let her come on in.

So Jen, we're going to put you in the hot seat right away. Welcome. We're on quality indicator number five. We're looking at the straining provided. And there's a question on the second evidence -- the second bullet for evidence. And the question to the group is what would we see in the link -- what would be submitted to show evidence of the foundations for literacy? That's highlighted now in yellow. What were you thinking?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Just one second. Well, I guess -- I mean, it could be as simple as notes are provided or lesson updates. Because there are -- what's the word I'm looking for. I'm so frazzled right now. Check-ins, if you will, through the program after unit -- I don't remember what numbers -- 9 and 14 or whatever. There are sort of brief assessments, if you will check-ins, to see how things are going.

I guess you could maybe include something like include information data from that. Or could just be as simple as some lesson plans used. I'm not --

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Sherry, does that answer your question?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm trying to -- this is Sherry. I'm trying to pull it back. So training is provided to gen ed teachers. So how is demonstrating that you're using foundations evidence that training is provided to gen ed teachers?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. I think that's a good question. Is Tracy here? This came about from -- is Tracy here?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, she is.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Okay. Because I think this came about from the All Together Now grant. This was one of their recommendations that this foundations for literacy curriculum should be implemented. I think that's where this came about.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Thanks, Jen. So maybe we could --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is kind of like our -- this is Sherry. This is like the UDL piece above. I want to be really careful that we're not being prescriptive. My district uses foundation for literacy. We do it pre-K plus three. When you highlight a specific curriculum, I get concerned because there are other methodologies. Is that our role in this tool to prescribe what should be used?

>> SHARON HENRY: I agree. I don't think we should be prescriptive. I'm wondering if you scroll up a little bit, Sherry, one of the other questions that Jen and I had was is there any place throughout this number five where we should replace some of this language with 504, IEP, or ESTs? So in other words, some of these milestones and implemented strategies would be documented in those documents or is that not the case? Particularly as it relates to foundations of literacy and those milestones.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry. I'm going to defer to Jacqui's questions. When you use individualized specially designed instruction, that's for students on IEPs. That's between 504 and EST. If you see it is warranted, then you really are in the domain of special education.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So we should leave the language in each of these bullets as we currently have it, then, Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I need to click faster. I think -- I just want to warn us about being prescriptive and I would remove the piece about foundations of literacy. We're looking for meetings notes from sessions to see if training is in place. And we're looking at -- that the professionals are currently licensed, which means you're doing training. So I think that the one that's highlighted in yellow doesn't fit with the group.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I definitely see your point. And Tracy has just raised her hand. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. The only comment I think I have about the New Hampshire All Together Now report is they just commented that Foundations of Literacy is a good program for kids that are Deaf and Hard of Hearing. So I wonder if this popped up in this area just to say that maybe that's one thing that could be used to train teachers and staff about programs for kids that are Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Or if they're already using that, you go, yea. They're using that program.

I agree even in IEPs you don't want to specify any certain program.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So I think we're hearing a consensus that we can drop this piece of evidence. Okay. Moving to the next criteria, the use of assistive technology includes a function evaluation. And my question to Tracy is this is an appropriate term to convey what we're trying to have happen here which is a qualified

provider in the classroom watching the actual action during a classroom day. And then the evidence for this bullet would be evaluation notes redacted from the observations of the classroom. So Tracy, just want to comment on that? And we'll take other comments.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. I don't know if I added -- was this -- is this the language that was written in the section? Maybe so.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think so, yes.

>> TRACY HINCK: Okay. So a functional evaluation because when children are assessed and anyone's assessed in an audiologist sound booth, that doesn't always translate into how they do in school. I think the idea behind this is that when you use any kind of assistive technology, you want to make sure that that technology is benefitting the child in their environment.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> TRACY HINCK: So that's a really important thing. Because what they do in the sound booth doesn't equate to what they're doing in the classroom.

>> SHARON HENRY: And so the term functional evaluation is an acceptable term that everyone will understand as not just jargon?

>> TRACY HINCK: It's a thing. It's a kind of test, but I think the general term functional evaluation is looking at a variety of things that assess the benefit of that technology which I think is appropriate for all assistive technology across the board whether it's for speech and language or Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Or any area we're providing. We want to know it's working.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right. Thank you, Tracy. And Sherry has her hand raised.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So I'm trying to be more -- thinking about how can we be a little bit more specific than evaluation notes or meeting notes. So this is where we could be prescriptive. For example, a functional evaluation -- and yes, that's a very education-familiar term in that it's beyond a general assessment tool. It's an ability to be used every day. And I wonder if instead of evaluation notes from observations of classroom something like observation of classroom template includes use of assistive technology.

So it allows us to be a little more structured in what we're looking for. And the same could be true above educational sessions include evidence of template for educational sessions include demonstration of something. So I'm just worried by saying meeting notes, we may want to put something a little more specific so that we ensure those pieces are included by requiring some kind of template and wondering what the group would think of that.

>> SHARON HENRY: I would echo that. And maybe Sherry, you could just maic a note there and I can go back and do the editing. And Jen, you can help me with the wording as well. I think the next bullet down, Sherry. Yeah. There too. All right. And if you scroll the document up so we can all see it.

Okay. So the last two bullets, one is about training provided to student, staff,



and parents on the use of technology. And again, based on what we just learned, rather than just saying the minutes from the training sessions, we would be a little bit more prescriptive, perhaps, and ask for a template so that we know really what -- what's being covered in those meetings.

And then the second piece of evidence is the updated training to the student when the technology is updated. So at least a minimum of a yearly review which it's hard to believe the technology isn't changing faster than that. But when it is updated, then it definitely needs to be additional training. Jacqui has her hand raised. Go ahead.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Thanks. And again from the special education lens, assistive technology. So the IDEA, the federal law, requires schools to provide assistive technology training for the teachers, the child, the family. That's written into federal law.

So what we'd expect to see as evidence is that training being written into the child's IEP. If it is a student with an IEP. So that's just another consideration as that is an opportunity to drive home it is the law and it also needs to be written there.

>> SHARON HENRY: So Sherry, could you please make that edit there? Thank you so much for that comment, Jacqui. Okay, great.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Is that what you were looking for, Jacqui? I just wanted to capture that.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. Thanks for asking. So the service page -- okay. It gets a little complicated. The program modification and accommodations page has a section listed for staff. So personnel who needs support and training. It's located in that program accommodation page. If it is for families or anyone supporting that child at home, that would be written in the service page as a related service. Because we couldn't make it easy. It would be in two locations.

(Silence).

>> SHARON HENRY: Does that capture it now, Jacqui?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you so much. And Stuart has a question. Please go ahead, Stuart. Or a comment.

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: Yes. Thank you. So I was reading it. I just wondered if -- sorry. Hold on. The lighting is a little dark. It's hard for the interpreter to see. One moment. The lighting in here is not great.

All right. That's better. Thank you for your patience. So I think, you know, it would be a big improvement for --

>> INTERPRETER: Hold on. Nicole, are you getting that?

>> INTERPRETER: I would need it repeated as well.

>> INTERPRETER: Nicole? I can't hear you, Nicole.

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: So far you've done a great job of updating this list and matching it to what needs to be fixed in the system. As I said, great job so far. Getting at the meat of what we need to change.

Now, if something comes up. If there's some sort of issue with a student -- let's see. They're not kind of following the standard. It doesn't match. It's not working for them. Is there some sort of action that could be made to accommodate them? How to remedy the situation because it's not working for them. Let's see. Maybe they need some sort of accommodation, some sort of assessment. You know, what can be done for them?

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you for your question, Stuart. Sherry, would you like to address that? With your speed hat on?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Oh, Stuart. You ask the best questions. I think that our intention is that we create a really good tool where programs can demonstrate their ability to meet these indicators that we can then begin to thin out the pool of those who are quality program providers and those who are not.

Also that programs will choose to self-assess based on this tool so that special ed directors like I used to be will be able to pull from some quality resources. The special ed process should be the place where that conversation could be had if a program has this level of structure in place and has demonstrated that they can meet these expectations, the hope would be that we would then have higher-quality programs. And also that special ed directors and teachers would know what to look for if they feel like things aren't going right.

So I don't think this answers all of the problems and maybe probably what you just asked, Stuart, but I think the first step in making sure we're offering to our students what they need. Does that answer your question, Stuart?

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: Yeah. Like I said before, I think it's a wonderful first step. And I think more than a first step, obviously. You guys have been doing a lot of work. But I think really that the program, whatever the providers -- I want to make sure that things have the ability to continually improve over time and are really set up for success. But I think what you guys have been doing so far is wonderful.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you so much, Stuart. And in a little while, we'll talk about some of our longer-term steps that we're hoping to make. But Jen has her hand raised.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think -- and I'm sorry I missed the beginning. I don't know if you already talked. I think we're going to later talk about the discussion with the gentleman from Washington. But that was one of his -- I think his question is the same as yours, Stu. If we do all this and you find out whatever we find out, then what? And so I think I agree that that is definitely something we as a group will need to think about. The fact that we do this, then what. And maybe Sharon is going to talk about that as well. I think that was definitely a big takeaway for me. Just thinking about --

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. Right. So our goal here, Stuart, is develop the best assessment tool possible. And then our next step is going to be work on implementation and collaboration with the AOE.

I'm going to get us back to the document. One more under bullet five. There is a monitoring plan to ensure that hearing aids and other technology are working consistently as required by the IDEA. The evidence is the monitoring plan -- and I guess I defer to the experts here. Is monitoring plan part of the IEP? Should that language be added here with the dates of equipment checks? And the other piece if there is faulty equipment identified, take immediate action. That's within 24 hours to remedy the situation in a timely manner. So feedback on the two pieces of evidence here. Laura, go ahead.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I'm not sure if it's to this or not. I forgot to ask this earlier, I apologize. But having the different discussions with parents and their concerns like for example the primary teacher in the class --

>> INTERPRETER: Interpreter is trying to clarify something real quick.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: So, for example, this one person who's working, they have one specific job. Then they're asked to do something else. What? I'm supposed to be with this Deaf and Hard of Hearing student, I'm not supposed to go make photocopies for you. I wonder if we need to add language to emphasize that their role, what they're doing is they're not supposed to be doing other things. They're not there for X, Y, and Z, they're there for A, B, C. Maybe we should add that. Does that make sense? Do you know what I mean by that?

>> SHARON HENRY: I do, Laura. But I don't think this is the place to be that prescriptive. I think if you have qualified providers and they're licensed doing their job, then that sort of behavior is minimized. Maybe others have a thought. I see Sherry has a hand raised. Go ahead, Sherry.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So to answer Laura's question, to me that fits under supervision and evaluation. That if a program is evaluating, supervising their team members well, that kind of behavior would be addressed. So that would be where I would fit it in. In terms of the evidence around when faculty, when faultily equipment personnel, within 24 hours action, I don't think we can -- one, I don't think you'd ever -- that's really hard to enforce. I don't know how you would demonstrate that. Maybe somebody has some other ideas, but I don't know how you would.

And often it's equipment needs, it's getting into the audiologist or the -- you know. That would be really tough. I'm not sure how you would do that. I would love that to happen and pragmatically I don't know if it can.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. I think this is every parents' bane and it was mine. 24 hours may be unrealistic. But I think the accountability of not letting the FM system sit on the school nurse's desk for a week or two and so forth was the intent. Jacqui has her hand raised. Go ahead, Jacqui.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Thank you. Just the word "monitoring plan," you know, specific to students with disabilities. The federal language is around in IDEA the routine checking of hearing aids and external components of surgically implanted medical

devices. So it is within IDEA that each LEA must ensure that hearing aids worn in school by children with hearing impairments including deafness are functioning properly.

The word "monitoring" gets a little confusing with the fact that districts are monitored for their compliance with federal and state rules. So sometimes that word triggers that. But to what extent could we find some language that also embraces that routine -- that routine checking that how you demonstrate how you are routinely check for the effectiveness of these devices for these students.

Again, it is definitely within the spirit of the law. And there's also some ambiguity. How frequently within the time frame that could be a suggestion. But I'm just putting that out there. Routine check is the actual language that as somebody who would be monitoring the district that has an IEP, where they're supposed to demonstrate for us they're doing this. We would be looking for some type of checklist that is showing the routinization of those dates and who's doing it and the outcome of that activity action.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you for that comment. I see Tracy has her hand raised. Go ahead.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. Jacqui, I'm glad you mentioned that. In practice that is true. The American Academy of Audiology has an educational practice guideline so part of fitting of an FMDM system is a use plan. Within that use plan should be the team's decision on what that routine monitoring looks like it and should be recorded in writing, who's checking it in the outcome. So if something isn't functions, it's not always the responsibility to repair it and let the parents know that it's not working. So when systems are selected fit verified and validated properly by a properly licensed audiologist, they should be following those AAA guidelines. So then it would be addressed in what that routine checking looks like.

And you're right, routine is ambiguous. Once a week? Once a day? Twice a day? AAA says the team needs to come up with a plan and on what routine looks like for each student. Certainly a high school student probably can check their own equipment; right? And report out to somebody once a week to let you know. But a kindergartner or preschooler can't.

I don't know if evidence would be something to the effect of the teams fitting or -- fitting plan. If there's some way to put a use plan as the evidence of that equipment.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think that's a great idea, Tracy. And could you as part of the appendices get us the citation of those best practices and maybe even a template that providers could adopt if they wanted to?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yes, I will.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you so much. Okay. So I think we've got it. Thank you for capturing that, Sherry, in real time. And now I'll turn number six over to you. I believe that you and Tracy worked on number six together.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thanks. Number six a language, literacy, academic progress and social emotional wellness should be monitored frequently and reported to the same requirements for all students. Program staff advocate for and document that: Providers of services such as sign language interpreters are regularly evaluated. So a program framework for regular supervision and evaluation of service providers. So often programs have their own internal structures for supervision and evaluation of their team. And so we would want to see what is the program framework or expectations for supervision and evaluation? That's one evidence piece.

And the second evidence piece would be supervision process includes individuals with expertise in the same areas as the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind service providers. Feedback? Sharon?

>> SHARON HENRY: So I've always been confused about this, but isn't there a test that one can take to determine one's sign language interpretation proficiency? And is this the appropriate place to incorporate any language regarding that? Go ahead, Jen.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes, there are tests and there are different language -- there is a language test. There is an ASL proficiency. There is also the SLPI which is the sign language proficiency interview. They are looking at your ability to sign. There's also the educator and interpreter proficiency assessment which is looking at your ability to interpret in an educational setting where it's focused. So it gets sticky.

In Vermont there are no regulations currently or there are no mandated, you know, required qualifications.

>> SHARON HENRY: So could we go with current recommended best practice would include this and include that in the appendices?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes. Yeah, I think that -- yeah. I think we could do that.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So this is Sherry. So program framework include ing assessment tools? Again, I think if we make this, it has to be something that's going to last over time. And so, for example, I have a program framework for my district faculty and staff. We have selected a certain evaluation tool. In my framework, I clearly delineate when, how often, all the expectations.

So for someone to have a high-quality program, all those elements should be in your program framework for supervision and evaluation.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. Scratching from my video here. And Laura is suggesting in the chat that once again this -- these tools could be something a sped ed director could reach for to assess whether or not the ASL interpreter that he is hiring is qualified enough to serve this particular student.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. So have --

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Yeah. I've had several people ask me about that. You know, how do you know if they're qualified or not? I let them know, there is no requirement in the state of Vermont. There are ways you can assess a person's qualifications looking

at their history, referrals, things like that. Recommendations. You're able to recruit some people like maybe have a panel and look at their skills and see if they actually, you know, know what they're doing or not.

You don't want someone showing up saying I know ASL, I'm ready to go. You want to make sure. You want to see them in action. I think I've been called three times to be involved in three different panels to assess somebody's skills. So this is happening.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is Sherry, so this could be another link. Program framework including assessment tools and expectations for regular supervision and evaluation of service providers. We will come up with a ratings scale eventually to see how is that determined by the reviewers. And then supervision processes include individuals with expertise. We want to make sure the people doing the supervision and evaluation have the skill set to provide the feedback that is needed.

The next is programs and services routinely evaluated. Program's process for regularly reviewing student outcomes, and for developing, recommending, implementing, and monitoring program improvements. So we're looking for a process that is part of the program that allows for these things to happen. The evidence is deemed as a process in place that allows this to happen.

>> SHARON HENRY: So this is Sharon. So as a provider, you have access to a student's outcomes. Does that mean academic outcomes as well? I assume so, but I want to clarify.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So it should be whatever the team has decided is important. Every plan whether it's IEP, 504, or EST. To access the program. And again, I don't want to be too prescriptive, but the students' plan, we're looking for the process that is used to assess programs and services to ensure these pieces. And so I think the student outcomes is dependent on each student. Could be different reasons.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Sherry.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thanks. Okay. The next step, IEP, 504, EST plans are developed based on the individual student needs rather than available services. Evidence IEP, 504 plan, or EST plan demonstrates alignment between student needs and services/supports provided. And look at the direction of the supports. And to me that would ensure that it's not based on what's available but what's based on the student needs. To me this is a really important assessment tool.

>> SHARON HENRY: I like it.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. Next one. Deaf education team is provided with opportunities to meet periodically to discuss roles and responsibilities, share ideas and current practices, and to attend training specifically related to their professional capacity. Evidence: Dated meeting agenda and minutes that demonstrate teams opportunities for collaboration and consultation. Sharon?

>> SHARON HENRY: So my question here is the Deaf education team. Does

that also include the personnel of the team who are serving student who is are hard of hearing? Or is this just a terminology issue?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is the language that was in the NASDSE. So I think the Deaf education team can be a whole group of individuals. To me it is whoever is supporting students. But this is opportunities to collaborate. And basically what it's required is that the program establish a regular time and it could be dated meeting agenda, dated meeting agent and could be schedule -- dating media agenda and minutes.

This is going to happen, here are the times, and here's an agenda from one of those meetings. Stuart?

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: So discussing the language and -- it seems like the evaluation is based on the provider. And it might be worth it to have, you know, some of that come from the students themselves. And for example, for social and emotional well being of students having them included in that process to feel like they can connect and be a part of that progress. Maybe have, you know, a psychological assessment included or involved either in English or ASL or both. But to be a direct assessment with the student themselves could be a benefit. So that was my thought.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Stuart. Hang onto that thought. Trying to figure out how to fit that in. But I absolutely agree. I think it may be below or may be in here somewhere, but please hang onto that. Because we're getting there, I think.

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: Okay, great. Sounds good.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So number eight is access around Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Needs access to students and staff like them. Access to professional personnel is provided in the child's language and communication mode. Evidence program staff directory includes professional personnel fluent in child's language and communication mode.

So this was a tricky one in terms of how to find evidence. But every program that offers a staff directory, I don't know a program that doesn't. That would be an opportunity for them to demonstrate that someone in their employ is fluent in the child's language and communication mode. How do people feel? That was a tricky one, so I'd appreciate some feedback.

>> SHARON HENRY: Hi, this is Sharon. I think this is a tricky one. And I wonder if we could also have it be a listing of community members who are volunteering and engaging in the school in order to help meet this need.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Go ahead, Jen.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. Sorry, I'm trying to read what you're writing too. I agree, it's tricky. Because just having somebody on staff doesn't necessarily mean that the children or the students are going to have access to them on a regular basis, if that makes sense.

So I feel like there needs to be a way to have dates of scheduled get

together or something of the sort so you can see that it's actually happening.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Could it be there is -- could it be that meeting notice includes an adult who is fluent in the child's communication mode? So maybe that an individual is on the team, the student's team that is fluent? But this is more about interaction than decision making. That's the tricky part.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. This is more the social piece. Yeah.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And how students may interact with this individual. And opportunities. So program staff director includes professional personnel fluent in child's language and provides students with the opportunity -- I know my child would not take advantage of that, but I think if we provide the opportunity.

>> SHARON HENRY: It's more likely to happen. I think we should include dates here as Jen had suggested of when it actually happened.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: But if a student doesn't want to -- that's the tricky part.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Offered.

>> SHARON HENRY: But you can document it was offered and then declined.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: One more time, Jen.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I was just saying that at least the dates show when that opportunity was offered to the student. And you're right the student may turn it down, but had the opportunity.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How does that look?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think that looks good.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And we can also list community members available to meet this need. Okay. Stuart?

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: Maybe community members and organizations as well, you know, who -- maybe events or something like that that are offered that could be used to provide information for schools, for students. And students could see there's events. And I also had another thought. Let me think of an example. Maybe not having Deaf and Hard of Hearing students that are all randomly placed everywhere, but have maybe a regular set meeting or event maybe through the service provider who might host or something an event that the kids or students could all go to and then maybe meet each other and say, oh, I'm from this school's district and whatnot.

(Silence).

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Stuart. Help me with the language. Social interactions to the students sharing similar communication --

>> SHARON HENRY: Modes.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How does that work, Stuart?

>> STUART SOBOLESKI: Thumbs up.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you. Sharon?

>> SHARON HENRY: So just a piece of business here. I think quality indicator number nine is really quickly. But I want to be mindful of the agenda. We were



supposed to stop the review of this document at 2:10. But I think we could hold off number ten until next week. Because it involves the state and we've lost Jacqui because she had another meeting to go to. Unless number nine is really long. I would say we table nine and ten until next week. Again, Jacqui's input especially for number ten is helpful. How do people feel about that so we can look at the rest of the agenda? Good, okay.

All right. So that is a great amount of work. I think this document is shaping up really, really nicely. Again, your focus is going to be making the best tool that utilizes existing evidence. And as we begin to wrap up nine and ten, we now need to begin to think about planning our next steps in the formatting of the document, really tightening up the language and doing the fine tooth comb sort of piece of the work.

We also need to include our definitions and begin to think about our appendices. So I think where we are going is that we've already identified some tools that need to be in the appendices. And Tracy agreed to pull together the American audiology best practices for the AAA guidelines. Thank you, Tracy. And Jen, if you could pull together the ASL proficiency testing, I think we should include those in the appendices. Thank you, Jen.

The other thing that is listed there is us as a committee to make a recommendation on who the qualified reviewers would be. Once a provider or a vendor decides to use this tool and they submit the evidence, we have to work out where the evidence is going to be submitted and where is it housed? Most importantly we need to decide who is qualified?

If the evidence is submitted and it just sits on the shelf or a computer somewhere, it does us no good. So these implementation steps are where we're going to need to begin to shift our focus to and in the upcoming weeks. And today at 4:00, Sherry and I are meeting with Chris Case who is -- oh, I never get the title quite right. But the special education director, to whom Jacqui reports. And we're hoping to work we the AOE to work out the implementation steps and timeline. That's why we're meeting today at 4:00.

The other big piece that I see as a need is to develop the -- I'll call it a scoring rubric or a grade or meeting high-quality standards, somewhat meeting, or not meeting at all. So the sped director, whoever is interested in this information, has a sense of should I hire this person or providers or should I not? So those are the big pieces I see we have left to do. The appendices, pulling together these tools, flushing out the qualifications of the reviewers. And then the scoring rubric.

So I'm going to let you think about that for a week and think about which one of those tasks you might be up for volunteering for. And then maybe next week we can begin to parse that out. Because I think the bulk of our meeting next time on the 17th, I believe that's the date, should be on finishing nine and ten. And then going through the whole document in its entirety looking for consistency of language and, again, that fine

tooth comb sorts of things.

And when we go back to the document again, we have to be mindful of language for blind and visually impaired. Amelia has an email into Tracy Evans. Tracy just hasn't gotten back to her. So that information when it's available I'll help to put that into the document to make sure that's clear.

And then the final goal is by the end of June, this whole document is put together. And a final report is written that we have to start now so it's done by June and give it to the AOE. Then we work with the AOE and partner with them on an implementation plan. Is that clear? Any question about process and timeline going forward? I think we have five or six meetings left. Any questions or comments before I move onto the next agenda item? Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: If it's okay, I'd like to take what we've approved and work with the format so that it will be easier to access the information and may help us when we go to do the fine tooth piece. Is it okay if I work on some formatting of what we've already agreed to?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. And I think that Sherry and Tracy had done number nine and Jen and I had done number ten. So if any of those two working writing groups need any more tweaking to those respective quality indicators, please do so before next Monday. And then the group will vet those two next Tuesday.

The other thing for next Tuesday is I unfortunately have to be in Washington, D.C., for one of my husband's medical appointments. And I'm hoping to join by phone call. But I'm wondering if I could have a volunteer from the group to take notes and just to write up the minutes. So in case our appointment runs late and I'm not able to join at all, someone could capture -- someone other than Sherry because she'll be facilitating the meeting could capture the meeting minutes for me. Any volunteers?

(Silence)

We do have to post them publicly, so the meeting has to be documented somehow.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I'm just looking at my schedule to make sure that I'm planning to be there. I can try. I can try. I will put that out there. I will try.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. Thank you, Jen. I appreciate your help. Okay. So the next item for the next five minutes, I want to have Laura give us a two-minute summary of the state of Virginia documents. And if there's anything in any of them that's helpful for assessment we should be paying attention to. Laura?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Give me one second. All right. So first I met with a woman who was running VNOG of online counseling. Oh, excuse me. Consultation. Virginia Network of Consultants. So their state has eight wards across the state. And seven providers for Deaf and Hard of Hearing students in the state. And five regional programs for Deaf and Hard of Hearing and DeafBlinds who tend to go to those programs.

And only has 75 students. With additional disabilities. Only two of them are

just Deaf. A lot of them are DeafPlus plus.

So they're trying to upload resources to the state of Virginia and share with me. Part of how they're doing the assessment and those professional categories. Let me check. Hold on. Just pulling something up on my computer. Can anybody see the screen I'm sharing?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. You have another minute left, Laura. Oh, okay. I'm just trying to scroll down a little bit. Of course, can't -- there we go.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: So if you see this, there's 13 -- each of them has an -- so you guys can all look over this too. But it's really just general information for you guys to keep in the back of your head about each of the categories for the assessment.

So the first one is under audiologist.

>> SHARON HENRY: So let me just stop you. This for assessing the student or assessing the professional.

>> INTERPRETER: The interpreter is trying to get her attention.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: For the students. This is for assessing the student. We didn't really have --

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Was there anything at the entire program level? Will they assess the entire program?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: What they gave me -- hold on. One moment. So they only gave me things related to the students. But not related to the interpreting or professionals.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Let's put that on hold for right now. I'll take a look at those documents as well. And I want to turn our attention now to Jen. Jen met with Rick Haun from Washington Center for Deaf and DeafBlind Youth, I believe it's called. So it was a very productive meeting, but Jen I'll let you describe -- since I had to drop.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. We just talked through the process a little bit. We sort of tried to connect with him. He was involved with the -- what they're calling the assessment of the services and programs in Colorado which I spoke briefly about last week. Or last meeting.

But after sort of more digging, it really became clear that they were not really evaluating. They were doing more of a gap analysis and then, you know, offering what needed to be focused on from that gap analysis. Sorry, I'm just -- I'm looking at my notes. And jump in any time, Sharon.

I think one of his biggest -- one of my biggest takeaways from him is we have to have sort of an anchor person at -- preferably at the Agency of Ed that can help facilitate what is going to happen with this information. You know, once we gather it. That was the big takeaway for me.

He also emphasized -- he also emphasized just the need -- bye, Laura -- to have everybody involved --

[ Meeting ended by host at 2:25 p.m. ET ]