

## REALTIME FILE

D/HH/DB Council  
The School Age Subcommittee  
Wednesday, May 25, 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: Rebecca Lanne unfortunately cannot attend. Her household is stricken with COVID. Including herself and her daughter and a few others. So she won't be joining us. Jen Bostwick will be just a few minutes late. But I see that Jacqui and Dawn have joined us. Welcome to you both. So I think we'll get started. Jacqui, I would ask that you introduce Dawn to us and welcome Dawn as our stakeholder for today.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Good morning. Dawn, I particularly am grateful that you are here. I know our districts and families are really experiencing challenging conversations and dialogue in light of yesterday's tragedy. You know, for all of us. Our hearts are with all of our schools and staff and kids and families right now. So thank you for being here. I wasn't sure if you or Lisa would be able to make it. But Dawn Campbell is here. Dawn is an associate director of special education for southwest Vermont. She's also an elected member of the Special Education Advisory Panel which advises the state agency of education on the unmet needs of all students with disabilities. And also advisement on improving outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

Dawn and Lisa, her colleague from Southwest Vermont, have also been very active -- actively engaged with providing insights and thoughts on the work with the agency as part of frequent meetings that I have with directors. So I reached out to them personally. I thought they would have some valuable insights and comments to provide to this group. So welcome. Welcome, Dawn.

>> DAWN CAMPBELL: Thank you very much, Jacqui.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you for the introduction and Dawn for taking the time. I know it's an incredibly busy time of year and a particularly difficult day for our family and school-aged children all over the country today. A reminder that if you are not speaking to please turn off your video. Makes it easier for the interpreter and for those

who are accessing the ASL provided there. I saw that Tracy just joined us. Welcome, Tracy.

Could I have a motion to accept the meeting minutes from -- what was last week? May 17th.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Motion to approve the minutes from May 17th. This is Sherry.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. And a second?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Second.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Second as well.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I think Laura was the second, thank you. Okay. So our work today, our primary work today is to go through the working draft of the quality indicators that Sherry emailed to us last May 17th. So Sherry, while I'm introducing this, I'll ask you to pull it up on your screen.

We have gone through the document once and then Sherry reformatted it for us in a table format to make it more user friendly. And then our job over the last seven days was to go into the document and put your initials next to any item or indicator that you thought might be able to be eliminated. Or that was, perhaps, redundant. Because our goal is to try and make this document as concise, succinct as possible to increase usability, increase friendliness, and encourage adaptation of the document so we can share high-quality services for kids who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind in their families.

So Sherry, I will mute myself and turn it over to you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Good morning, everyone. So I think the next step is -- so I just started building out the introduction. I know there's a lot more that needs to go in there as well as the definitions. So that's to be determined. I quickly looked at the document yesterday. And Sharon went in and identified a number that she felt was redundant. I just want to -- and I think we could eliminate those, but I noticed there's still many that are in there. What would you like to do for the process? I mean, for efficiency purposes, I can delete the ones that Sharon's identified.

I wonder who else has been through the document. Amelia I know went through the document, because there was a correction she asked me to make. Do you think this has been vetted enough to reduce it? Or -- I mean -- and here's the other possibility. Because we know there are going to be others looking at this. Do we reduce the ones that Sharon's identified and then do we submit a larger document knowing perfectly well it's going to be edited and reviewed by someone else?

So I think those are options we can -- and would like some feedback. Do we make the reductions as identified thus far by Sharon and then build the rest of the document out for purposes of getting reviewed? Any thoughts from the team?

>> SHARON HENRY: Hi. This is Sharon. I just want to know who on the call has had a chance to go through the document. If you can just say yea or nay, you had a

chance or you didn't have a chance. Because maybe if we -- if people did not have a chance, maybe 15 or 20 minutes of our time could be used going through it one more time to see if there are obvious redundancies. So just going down the list. Laura? Have you had a chance to look at it?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I did when you first sent it on the 18th, but I wasn't sure if you wanted me to give feedback. It looked like you basically took it from the original document and put it in there; right?

>> SHARON HENRY: That is correct. And the request at our last meeting was to then put your initials next to any indicator that you thought was redundant or you thought could be eliminated. So if you saw things that you think can be eliminated, hold onto that thought, and then we'll circle back to you. Okay?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I mean, I could set aside time on Friday to schedule my input. Again, I missed the last meeting, so I wasn't sure if you wanted me to give more feedback. The meeting before the last, you asked about trying to condense it, but I didn't quite understand. When you said condense it, what exactly you meant. It felt like everything you have there is already crucial information.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right. And it all may be very crucial information. So our task was to see if we could make it shorter. So providing your feedback on Friday by going in and editing this document would be great. Okay? Let me just ask Jacqui, did you have a chance to look at it?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. When it was released, I did do a cursory overview of that. And saw things as they pertained to categories, seemed to make sense. I do agree if we spend 15 or 20 minutes especially where we have two folks new to the table that I think that would be a great exercise if the rest of the group thinks we can use our time that way.

>> SHARON HENRY: And let me just ask Jen and Amelia -- well, I know Amelia did. Jen, did you have a chance to look it over? The reason I'm asking, if you thought everything was essential, you didn't put your initials next to anything you think was redundant. So Jen, did you peek at it?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I haven't looked at it recently, to be totally honest. I missed the last meeting. I have been looking at it consistently so were there major changes made recently? I apologize.

>> SHARON HENRY: No, not at all. But we're trying to look at it now to -- with an eye towards making it more succinct. So I think, Sherry, if you could lead us through a suggestion as Jacqui suggested plus we have Dawn that could provide. That would be wonderful.

>> DAWN CAMPBELL: And also Lisa Johnson is here as well. She's also an associate director. She just can't be heard. We work for the same district and she's also very interested in this. I just don't want her forgotten. Thank you.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, thank you, Dawn. I didn't realize it. So she's calling in

by phone, is that the --

>> DAWN CAMPBELL: No, I think she's here. I can't see right now. But she's saying -- I don't know how come she can't be heard. I don't know.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I see the mute symbol there, so maybe she just needs to unmute herself. Or Lisa, please feel free to use the chat. I'll monitor the chat as well. So thank you for coming, Lisa. Okay. I'll mute.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. I'm going to do my best read aloud voice. If you hear things that are redundant, please interrupt. Or things you believe could be reduced.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Can you guys hear me now?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yes.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Oh, boy! I didn't know the magic Zoom code to unmute.

Thank you for having me. I'm excited to be here.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So welcome that you came. Appreciate it. It's a challenging day to an end of a very challenging year. I know it's been hard for us this morning. So under essential element one, unique needs of each student is considered. The descriptor is a full continuum of services individualized to the needs of each student for full engagement in school programs.

The program demonstrates they are advocating for goals of students and/or family are represented and integrated. And the evidence would be meeting invitation, agenda, minutes, and/or other parent documentation redacted. In addition, communication modes and hearing status. Evidence is IEP, 504, ESD plan. Includes evaluation and progress data. Vermont state license teacher of the Deaf, licensed audiologist, licensed SLP, or DeafBlind specialist participating in meetings. Meeting agenda and/or minutes redacted.

The next element is number two. Expectations, educational programming, and future employment. The descriptor is programmatic opportunities provide access to high-quality learning which will impact future career plans. The first point is students are actively engaged in transition planning, evidences, minute meeting invitation include vocational rehab agenda and our minutes redacted.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sherry, sorry this is Jen. Can you --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Make it bigger?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Okay, sorry. Can you possibly make the font bigger? I'm sorry. I'm trying to read what Laura is saying. On the upper right of the screen you can adjust Zoom ratio.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I can just do it that way. Is that?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I got it. Okay. Sorry. Thank you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: No problem. Thank you, Jen. Students are actively engaged in transition planning, meeting including voc rehab. Next indicator. Student programs reflect learning profiles are modified on students' progress and instruction

meets student needs. And the evidence is Vermont licensed teacher of the Deaf Hard of Hearing and DeafBlind, professional participation in team meeting as evidenced by meeting invitation, agenda, personal learning plans, and/or minutes. Jacqui, do you have a point?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: We just wanted to make a note. We were just having a side chat. In the reference to vocational rehabilitation, voc rehab is going by the name HireAbility, one word. Whether we replace that or put it in parentheses. We didn't want to miss that important edit.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Go ahead, Laura. Nice. Terrific. Yes. Let's change as we go. We don't have to go back. I didn't know that. All right. So can I just -- I'll go back and approve that change later. Thank you. And so we have -- okay. Student programs, learning profiles. The next one is data-driven instruction and evidence-based practices are in place. Rationale for instructional programs are documented in the team meeting minutes. Sharon, you thought that was redundant to number five?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. If you drop down to number five, it sounded very similar to the first bullet where decisions about programs and strategies that are used with students are guided by recent research and evidence-based practice. Our evidence is citation of recent literature used to guide decision making. So we can take the evidence from above and perhaps put it down here. Because if you're collecting the same evidence, it suggests to me that the indicator is similar or that portion of the indicator is similar.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. Let me just -- so what I want to do is copy this, Sharon, and just paste the rationale is in the minutes?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And then I'm going to drop it down -- I'm just going to -- actually, just cut it. And then I'll paste it down to number five. Yeah. Close your eyes, I'm going to get dizzy here. And we'll put it here. As well as citations, but we're also looking for that conversation or dialogue in the meeting minutes.

>> SHARON HENRY: That the dialogue actually happened during the meeting and as a way to educate the teachers and the parents and other personnel in the meeting, yeah.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Great. All right. Is everybody good with that? So that allows us to -- oops, sorry. I'm just going to remove this line. Delete row. Okay. Opportunities for specialized programming in areas unique to deafness, reduced hearing, and DeafBlindness. Consideration of including expanded core curriculum as documented by meeting minutes.

>> SHARON HENRY: So again -- oh, I'm sorry. This is Sharon. Again, I thought it was similar to number one. Because number one is all about considering how unique the child is. And therefore all of the programming needs to take into consideration that uniqueness. And I looked at some of the evidence listed under number one. You look at

this under the subcomponent of number two. I wondered if this piece of evidence could be moved up above.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think it was Jen Bostwick who brought up the core curriculum as documentation. Any thoughts on that moving -- do we cut and paste it above? What are your thoughts, Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I -- sorry. What is the quality indicator? That we're looking at? I just want to see --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: We're looking at expectations, educational programming, and future employment. So programmatic opportunities provide access to high-quality learning. And the one before was unique needs of each student is considered.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think it's fine. I think if we want to move it up there, that makes total sense.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So are you saying I should cut this and put it above?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah, I think you can.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Because I know you had questions about the core curriculum piece. So that would be here. Does that look good?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: (Reading). Yeah, I'm not sure that evidence totally fits there.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Does it go up here better?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I don't know. That's what I'm trying to figure out where it would go.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Well, if you're writing the IEP, 504, you are considering it. I think it goes up above?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I agree. I don't know if it fits on the second one.

>> LISA JOHNSON: I'm not sure if you guys can hear me. This is Lisa.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yes, we can.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Great. In Texas where I'm from -- and I'm new to Vermont. So please excuse me if I don't know the Vermont system as well. We had supplements that were included in IEPs for circumstances like this. Where all the very specific information for a need touches autism or hearing impairment. That was recaptured, so it was reiterated into that supplement so that it was very easy to monitor compliance. And it was easy to make sure all areas were addressed. So it could be in the bottom certainly, and it belongs in the minutes. But it's also reiterated in a supplement at the back of the IEP. So it was topmost in mind that you were addressing those pieces.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So Jacqui, correct me. We used to do supplements but we don't anymore. However, there's a component of the evaluation that talks about other student needs. The challenges that -- well, what do you think, Jacqui? Again, it's been a few years since I've written a Vermont IEP.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Right. The supplemental page is there. There will be more in-depth description in the next iteration of the IEP that addresses what you're

talking about. As is the plan and report. So one thing we might consider is a redacted copy of that form, too, which is the evaluation plan and report.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm just thinking in terms of SPED law, where I've lived way too long, really -- the most important piece in terms of special education law is that there was a thorough discussion around considering the curricular and programmatic needs. If I was looking to see if a program was encouraging that kind of dialogue and making sure that school team and the parent is informed, I would look to the meeting minutes. And the notice of decision. As a real indicator to make sure -- because it's the consideration piece where it may not be as important as to whether that dialogue occurred. Because after consideration, the team may have decided we're not going to do that.

And the only place that consideration is going to be evidenced is in those meeting minutes. So -- yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: Hi. This is Sharon.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. Go ahead, Sharon.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. I was just going to bring up when I read I think Lisa's feedback and she had mentioned supplement in her feedback that she had written to Jacqui, I emailed -- I wonder if the communication plan that we have discussed is a form of a supplement. Again, I'm not an educator in the K through 12 arena. So I don't know the implication of all these words. But maybe Jacqui and Jen could speak to that.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. That's exactly what I was thinking. I was wondering if that was what you were alluding to, something similar to the communication plan. I think that Texas does use a communication plan which looks at all of the unique needs, you know, for Deaf and Hard of Hearing students. Especially related to their communication.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So where I'm stuck is the word "consideration" because that means there's a solid dialogue. We're hoping -- we want the program to provide opportunities for conversation and why decisions were made. And it's not necessarily going to be documented. The evaluation, not necessarily within the form. But it better be in the meeting minutes that you're going to see the opportunities, here's why we made the decisions. Here's why we picked this other this based on that student's unique needs. As someone I used to review every set of meeting minutes out of the middle school and high school, I better see that in the form 7b. So what's sticking me is the term "consideration." Every meeting better have minutes.

So I'm concerned about making this specific to special ed, because we want to make sure it adheres to all programs being offered to our students. Anyone want to arm wrestle that one? (Laughs).

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. So is "consideration" not strong enough?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: No, it's the right word. That's absolutely the right word.

Which means that the team -- again, back on the program, the program is to make -- is responsible that a thorough conversation -- that's consideration in legal term. Why one is selected over another. That better be in meeting minutes IEP, 504. To me it lands better there.

>> SHARON HENRY: I see a message in the chat where Lisa said I think IEP teams will need training on how to write minutes. That will probably fall to their school administrators to provide that training and not to the programs providing Deaf and Hard of Hearing services, but I think that's a great point, Lisa.

We've had conversations about other edits we would love to see on the IEP form so that we capture accurate disability categories. But that's a whole other conversation. But Jacqui, do you have -- you want to weigh in here on the communication plan as a supplement versus just using the meeting minutes, please?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: I think the meeting minutes are fine at this point. The communication plan we could go into is something for folks to consider. Yeah. I think the meeting minutes are fine.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Great. You can see I'm on my high horse every now and then. I'll back up. Okay. So that's great. So let's -- so we're going to remove based on that conversation, we're going to delete this row here. The next one is assure assessments and activities are accessible for all students regardless of their communication mode or learning style. And so ensure assessments and instruction, activities are accessible. So we're going to go down to number four.

Which one of these points, Sharon, were you indicating?

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. Hi. I think the first one. Students' language is comprehensively assessed at each transition. And then the next one where the opportunities for direct communication in the child's language and communication mode -- and the main bullet. Language and communication needs are considered in and accommodated in the student's learning environment. So those together in my mind were very similar to what was up above in sub-bullet number two.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I would agree, Sharon. I think there's redundancy there. Any pushback on removing this one, team? Thank you, Sharon. All right. Good. Assessment of language communication development. This may be another redundant based on that too. And strategies for developing skills in these areas to address gaps in language, listening, and communication and learning skills. And documentation of assessment of developmental milestones at regular intervals to include receptive and expressive language, pragmatics, morphology, and phonology. Students' language is comprehensively assessed at each transition. Would people concur those two are a match and maybe we can delete the one above?

>> SHARON HENRY: So this is Sharon. My concern here is number four, the stem is the student is considered in the student's learning environment. What is it up above? Are we missing anything?



>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think that one is more detailed than the one up above. Strategy for developing skills in these areas address gaps. So I think the one below is more specific than this one. I could copy and paste the evidence to include all those elements.

>> SHARON HENRY: And bring it down below. Again, I think if you're not assessing, then you cannot design an intervention program is appropriate.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Absolutely. So we would put that here. And there. Any thoughts about that?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I just had a question. Not exactly relevant to what you're talking about, but I kind of noticed something. It's a technical thing. I noticed that the word Deaf is mentioned 27 times in the whole thing. But the way it's worded is not consistent. Or like I saw one section under number eight. I was like, to consider visual impaired under the same category or separate category.

Like under the sentence that said efforts are being made to recruit and retain early intervention providers, teachers of the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind students. Simply add in TVI, teacher of visually impaired? I'm just asking. I don't know. I don't work in education. I don't know. Is it separate or are they the same thing?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I would defer to Tracy and Jen on that one.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Well, this is Jen. I think just because this is really focused on Deaf and Hard of Hearing students, that we wouldn't write TVIs, the teachers of the visually impaired, in this document I think is what I would say. I agree that often students who are DeafBlind have a TVI as part of their specialized team. I'm sorry. I'm just reading the information again.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: This is Amelia.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Suppose someone is looking for the first time. They might be asking themselves this question. If they found -- Amelia, I'm sure you can speak to this. If a child is Deaf and Blind, do I talk with the teacher for the Deaf or -- yeah, go ahead.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Yeah. This is Amelia. I think, you know, in Vermont our teams quite often have a TVI, because we do not have specialists trained in DeafBlindness. Tracy Evans from the New England Consortium is our DeafBlind professional, so we ask her to sit on our teams. And I think in this situation, I don't think TVI should be on there. Because they do not have the expertise in DeafBlindness. But we should have DeafBlind professional on there. They're two different professions.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Okay. Again, just a technical -- I just want to make sure if we're going to display the term, you know, like I said, avoid the words hearing impairment. But in this case we're doing Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind. I want to make sure when it's on the document, it's the same. I don't know.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. Thank you, Laura. That's great.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: This is Amelia again. I agree, Laura. I agree. When I was

reading through, there were a lot of different terminologies. I figured that would be one of our final edit things once we got things paired down. We would make sure all the terminology is the same across all different columns.

>> SHARON HENRY: And this is Sharon. I echo that. Remember our legislative charge is Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind. So we do need to go through and make sure we represent all the disability categories that are under that umbrella. We are based on the NASDSE guidelines. Amelia, I'm wondering would you have time to go through the NASDSE guidelines for DeafBlind and add anything in here that's glaringly missing. And we'll look for consistency of language.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Yes. This is Amelia, I should have time to go through it.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I just want to add Tracy from the consortium, she emailed us the DeafBlind NASDSE. But she said it was old. I don't know if that's still good to use as a reference point.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. Yes, she did email that to us. It's on our Google Doc drive. It is old, but that's all that we have. Currently.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Great. Super dialogue. We're really starting to do some condensing. Number three, we have families as critical partners. High levels of family involvement contribute to positive student outcomes. Parents are including in all levels of planning and decision making for their children. Parent input is documented in meeting minutes. Specialized activities and programs are shared with parents including meetings with other parents of Deaf, Hard of Hearing, or DeafBlind children. Social events specifically for children whose children are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, or DeafBlind. Transition support training, e.g. early transition to preschool, elementary to middle school, middle to high, high to post-secondary. And so emails documenting sharing of information, parent newsletters, school calendars, progress towards goals on students' educational plan pertaining to transition. And Sharon, you were wondering if this one about transition is also addressed in number two. Which is that goal and we do have this. Inviting -- students are actively engaged in transition planning.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. I think we need to change it to students and families, because below here in point number three, it's all about families being critical to planning. Which is absolutely true. But I think we could take the evidence from below and pop it up in here so that the families are involved there as well.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So you're just saying reduce this bullet, transitions support training. Remove that and then incorporate this toe evidence --

>> SHARON HENRY: To up above as well. Yeah.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. Oh, sorry. Got to love undo.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: This is Amelia. Are these two separate things though? Because up above, number two is all about the planning, including. And I read number three as transition and support just for the parents not -- to me it seems like it's two different things.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: One is training given to the parent making sure that the parents are aware of what's coming up. The family is aware. And then the other one is they're involved in what is my child going to be doing. The way I understand it as well, Amelia.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: Yes, that's how I understand it. I understand number three is if, oh, I can go meet with somebody and they're going to help me, teach me, educate me about different supports for transition and then number two is I'm going to take all of that knowledge I just gained and bring it to the table.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And this is Sherry. I think the other thing this addresses is not just the transition post-secondary. But all the other transitions families have to negotiate. So into pre-K, elementary, middle school. So I would agree that we should keep this one. This is a little more specific about all the transitions a family has to face.

>> SHARON HENRY: I'm fine with leaving it. That's fine. Thank you, Amelia and Jen. I'm going to back that up.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All I did was add "families." And I think they need to be part of that transitioning as well as students. So I think that was a good add-on and notice. Okay. So we got that, we got that. Parent counseling and training services necessary to implement the IEP, 504, EST goals are routinely provided to assist parents to support their children. I'm not sure why that's highlighted. Was that an addendum we wanted to include?

>> SHARON HENRY: I don't remember why it was highlighted either.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: That's another conversation for later. So we're just focusing on condensing. So meeting minutes, documenting discussion around parent supports needed to implement IEP goals as seen on service page. And maybe based on my previous conversation, it's not just IEP goals. IEP, 504, EST. As seen on -- I think meets minutes documenting discussion around parent supports needed to implement goals, I don't think we need to put service page there because that's very specific. Any feedback if I can just delete that part so it's more generic?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. Jacqui, I thought that you had mentioned -- I think it was two meetings ago -- about adding that specific information. I can't remember why. Do you remember why?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. Absolutely. When it pertains to IEPs in special education, parent training and counseling is a related service. So that is, like, when we're asking for when we would see evidence of that. It would be located in that service page under related service. So it's just another cross check area.

In the meeting minutes it would be considered. But if it actually happens and must be implemented, it would be written into the IEP in that section.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So what I can do is just do this. I can just put parentheses, if an IEP is in place found on -- how about that? Is that good?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah, it makes sense.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. Just because, again, not everyone who meets this category receives an IEP. I just want to make sure we have that expectation as well. All right. Moving on. Number four. Language and communication needs are considered. Language and communication needs are considered and accommodated in the student's learning environment. Students' language is comprehensively assessed at each transition. I think we added on another piece of evidence.

The next one is opportunities for direct communication with a child's peers and professional personnel in the child's language and communication mode is considered. Need a verb there. So communication plans must include discussion, ideas shared, and plans for these interactions and dates. We should probably make that redacted.

Next one, included in the student's plan. Is that redundant from above? I think we've already included that. IEP, 504, EST plan. So hang on. Here we go. We're going up. So in the beginning, representing an integrated consideration of both services, educational service support, individual language communication modes. Do you think this is already incorporated in this essential element? Or does it need its own bullet?

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. I thought -- now that I read it, I think it is redundant. I guess I must have missed it when I was doing this yesterday.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: You are such a slacker, Sharon. So are people okay if I remove this indicator?

(Silence).

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I think so.

>> SHARON HENRY: I'm fine with it, yeah.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Direct instruction of the communication mode integrated and implemented. That's a little more specific than what we have above. Student needs for assistive technology devices and services considered and provided where appropriate. That's more specific. And then students' communication needs are tailored based on the classroom or activity environment. That's to me more specific. Jacqui? Do you want to -- are you good?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yes.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. And then a student's communication -- okay. That's fine. And then a communication -- a continuum of placement opportunities available for students whose language and/or communication modes cannot be met with available school services. Again, that's that discussion piece. I think this gets a little deeper than the previous element.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. I think we need that specificity here.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yeah, no. I think it's good. Number five. Students receive individualized specially designed instruction that incorporates evidence-based practices. Decisions about programs and strategies are guided by recent research and evidence-based practices. Then we're citing recent literature and looking for

instructional programs are documented in the team meeting minutes. We had that conversation before.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Would it be worthwhile considering mandating training on a certain schedule or updated training opportunities for provider? Because, you know, if you've done it for a long time, you might not be up-to-date on the most recent.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Lisa. That's further down in this document.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Thank you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Good point. Thank you. And keep me honest on that, because I'm pretty sure we have it. But if we don't, please call us out. Training is provided to general ed teachers, specialized instructional support staff, personnel, and others to understand the language, communication, and literacy of these students. So we have meeting notes, notes from classroom observations, and then qualified providers are maintaining currency in the professional literature, practices, and evidence by attendance at continuing ed conferences.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sherry, this is Jen. I'm just -- as I'm reading this now, I wonder should we take out literacy needs? I mean, should we take out the word "literacy" and just say needs of the students? Because, I guess that just implies that that -- besides the language and communication --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How about educational?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. Something a little broader.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How about academic?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Because there could be social emotional needs. You know, it just seems this is maybe a little too narrow.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So do you not want academic?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Or educational maybe, because --

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. I like educational because that comes across education. Social emotional thinking, social thinking.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. I like that.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you both.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Educational and functional needs? Sorry, this is Lisa.

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm wondering if you think functional might fall under the umbrella of educational?

>> LISA JOHNSON: It should, but I'm not sure that we always think about it. We just sometimes think about academic needs of students, and we don't think about how functional needs impact their daily performance and their ability to learn. And how to generalize information received in one environment to a new environment.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I like how we're rewriting NASDSE. I can't wait to send it back to them. (Laughs). You guys, this is great. All right. So we got the functional and educational. I like that revision. The next one is -- Jacqui, did you want to chime in?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: No need. I was just agreeing that IDEA language is

educational and functional performance. And we had that conversation last week about the word "literacy" was a little bit too constrictive.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How about that?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yes.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So use of assistive technologies include a functional evaluation kind of to your point, Lisa. As to whether the technologies are appropriate to the student both in classroom and in other environments. And the -- sorry. Evidence is evaluation notes from observations of classrooms and other environments and completed by a qualified provider. Sorry.

There's lots going on in the district today. Training provided to the students, staff, and parents on the use of technologies and accommodations. So we'd have minutes from training sessions to the students, staff, and parents. We'd have a schedule for -- question mark there. I'm not sure. Okay. So minutes from training sessions. Minutes -- I would put and agendas. I think that's a good point. I'm not sure who added that.

And then scheduled for updated training. Often we say calendar for updated training. To the students, staff, and parents as needed. A min numb of yearly review or when technology is updated. Calendar for updated training for the student, staff, and parents. Not to the. As needed with a minimum of once a year or when technology is updated.

And then program accommodation and modification page and/or service page for student's IEP reflects need for assistive -- so for students, instead of IEP, plan. Because you would still have that in any one of those plans. Doesn't have to be necessarily an IEP program accommodation, modification.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Sherry, this is Lisa. So before we move too far away from this, I don't know if it's the right place for it or not. But I know in Texas we had mandated logs where teachers were required to check equipment daily, make sure that batteries are fresh and working. We typically put that on the accommodations page just to make sure that it was happening. Is that something to consider?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So it's not mandated unless -- Jacqui, you can update me. It's not mandated in Vermont or required. Tracy, did you want to add to that conversation?

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. I think that the routine checking is part of ed code and maybe Jacqui you can elaborate. There should be documentation, I just don't think it's always defined well.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. I agree, too. We don't have that as prescriptive as with Texas. But certainly for training, for those who are responsible for the assistive technology to check the equipment, these are things that can be written in that -- typically a frequency and duration of support area under that accommodations and modification page.

Let me get back to you with that language, because it is kind of a hybrid. I want to get it right. And again with the new revision of the IEP we have coming out, that's going to be much more clear within that page.

>> LISA JOHNSON: This is Lisa again. One more question. One other thing that we tried to be very clear about was if technology or equipment, hearing aids, et cetera, were needed to provide appropriate education, that we put it in that the school provided them. Is that something to consider? Or is that an issue here at all?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So I -- I'm not sure where that would be -- so that should be in the minutes in agendas in terms of that conversation in terms of what's required. Unless other people feel -- again, Vermont doesn't have that as part of their requirements. The expectation is that conversation is going to happen at that point. Again, remember we're coming from the orientation of what should be facilitating the conversation opposed to what do we have in our educational side. We're evaluating programs.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: And Sherry, the next bullet down, we actually talk about that's just what Lisa's talking about. Monitoring plan to ensure that they're working. So that is talked about. And making sure that we're putting the dates that it was checked and also documenting if there was a problem that the appropriate person is notified as quickly as possible.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thanks, Jen. All right. Lisa, does that address the thoughts you had?

>> LISA JOHNSON: Yeah, sorry. I'll hold my comments until the end. I don't want to take up time as I learn Vermont standards.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: No, that's helpful. It's keeping us honest, because there's elements in here. And again, we are deriving this from the NASDSE guidelines. And so hopefully that's the national standard. All right. I'm going to keep going. Probably until 11:00, and then I know there's other work that needs to be done today. So I'll pass it back to Jen. So we'll see how far we can get in the next six minutes.

So educational progress accountability and oversight. Providers of services such as sign language interpreters are regularly evaluated. Program and service -- oh. So this is for sign language interpreters. The next one, programs and services are routinely evaluated. And so that's looking at program process for regularly reviewing student outcomes, developing recommendations, implementing and monitoring program improvements.

The next one is IEP, 504, or EST plans are developed based on individual student needs rather than available services. The question is this redundant? I think the difference here is -- again, this is the conversation. We're not making decisions based on what we have available but based on student needs. Do people feel that's addressed enough in number one? Or not?

So my thought is this needs its own row, because I think this is often the

conversation. Decisions can't be made based on what is available, but have to be made based on the student needs.

>> LISA JOHNSON: This is Lisa. I'm not sure you can say that enough times. You know?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yes?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I just --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm sorry, go ahead, Laura.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: When you were talking about earlier -- so I shared in the chat room the link about the agency of -- dependency on the agency of education created that document about how they go about with screening -- I'm wondering if this should be added onto the assessment. It's relevant, sort of.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm not sure where you're referring to. Are you talking about at this point or another one?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: No, I put in the chat a link --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I can't read the chat. Just share what you're thinking. Because I can't do both. I'm not that good. Where's your concern?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I added in the chat room the agency of education created a document in 2019 that talked about screening. Because earlier I think it was Lisa who said something about should you do a daily check with batteries and whatnot. But I saw that we already have something in place related to screening. Am I right, Jacqui?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Around the screening, I mean, it's part of the -- the IEP team for students is to consider the needs of assistive technology. So that would be a part of the IEP meeting minutes about what was considered.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Right. And that would also be part of the 504/EST screening conversation. Is that are -- do we need additional assessment or screening to determine what level of services of support the child needs? That should be the part of any conversation. So that's the legal part in terms of screening people.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Maybe make that clear. Emphasize it applies to all three. People can get confused thinking it applies to one and not the others.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. Let me scroll up to assessment.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Again, I'm not the one with education background. This is just me looking at it thinking, what about this and that?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Would you like it here. Includes a functional evaluation or screening?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Yeah, just feels like it would be great to mention what -- how -- what is the standpoint from the state perspective of what they require when it comes to screening for hearing.

>> LISA JOHNSON: This is Lisa. Maybe periodic checks. To me screening is something that you do to an entire group to see if there's further need. But maybe



screening is the right word.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: In Vermont, "screening" is the term we use for someone who we are not sure if they're needed for special education services. And a screening can be done by a speech language pathologist. So screening versus evaluation. Evaluation is there's suspicion of a disability. Screening is understanding what the educational needs of the student is. That's --

>> LISA JOHNSON: Yeah, I see what you mean. I'm so SPED focused.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: And that's wonderful and that's also why as part of our next steps for review, having our 504 team also go through it with that lens too. It's going to be super helpful. Sherry, I did -- I did have an answer for Lisa about the assistive technology and, like, the requirements around who is checking for its functionality and services and batteries and maintenance. If I could just say it real quick.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Please do.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: The evidence for -- okay. So in Vermont -- so we have that requirement under the term "assistive technology services." So in that area of the rule, it specifically talks about maintaining and repairing or replacing assistive technology devices. And then -- so where would our evidence be? Assistive technology services is listed in Vermont as a related service. So therefore for IEPs, it would be listed on a related service page, that functionality. Does that make sense? It's a little bit like an algebraic word problem, but that is another area you would seek to have evidence to ensure that that is happening.

>> LISA JOHNSON: This is Lisa. So on the related services page, you would have a related service for daily check-ins for functionality?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. Under --

>> LISA JOHNSON: And the provider would be the general education teacher?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: That is whomever is identified -- you know, who is responsible for ensuring that happens. They can be working in consultation with them and have support. But that's just another different Vermontism. We have defined that assistive technology services is where that maintenance of functionality happens. And that it is considered a related services. And that's where it would be documented for evidence.

And that, too, Lisa, is going to be something different in training and going through with folks that how our rules are written, that's where it would fall.

>> LISA JOHNSON: You know I love training.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. I want to bring us back real quick. So I'm going to say Sharon, we have 30 minutes left. Can I ask that the team -- we only have two more pages. If people want to go through the last two pages. We've done a load of work. Make any notes and I can go back and we can do that by Friday afternoon. That could be great. So I punt it back.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you. Thank you for leading us through that. So

yeah. Go through the document one more time, please, and specifically focus on six through -- I'm sorry. Seven through ten which we didn't get through today. But we'll circle back to them next week when we meet on June 1st. And Sherry, could you please pull up the Word version of the quality indicator document where we had listed the appendices. What I'm interested in doing is given that we have Lisa and Dawn on the call, people in the special ed world as well as the rest of us, we'd like to hear from you about the things that we're thinking of including in our appendices that we are hopeful that they would be helpful to your work in working with this population.

And I hope that Jacqui shared with you a copy of the agenda, but there are items such as the communication plan -- I'll just wait -- give it one more minute.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm going to pull up the agenda.

>> SHARON HENRY: Perfect. That's even better. Yeah.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So for the next ten minutes or so -- yeah. I'd like to talk about is there anything missing from this appendices list and hear what else would be helpful. Then who would be interested in collating some of these resources. We have the communication plan. We have -- I don't know. The American Audiologist Association guidelines that address implementation of validation procedures for assistive technology.

One of the other things that we suggested as evidences was a template for classroom observations. What should be checked when a team goes into a classroom. The next one, a template for educational sessions for general education teachers. What should the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind provider be including when those educational sessions are being done? That was another piece we were thinking about asking for.

The next one was a template for a functional evaluation in the environments, school play, so forth, and to son. And then assessment tools for regular supervision for providers. I'd like to come back to that one. The recommended list of reliable valid tools for assessing children 3 to 22. And there was some resources from Virginia that might have been helpful.

The other thing we thought would be helpful is what are the definitions for qualified providers and professionals. We have to define it clearly. The other thing we need to define and provide are the testing available to determine proficiency of the qualified ASL interpreter. And the other thing we discussed is can we define the qualifications of the reviewers would would then review the evidence that is submitted based on the use of this tool in whatever form it may take. So we have defined what the evidence should be. And now we have to think about who's qualified to review this evidence and make a determination based on a scale meeting the quality metric, not meeting the quality metric, or partially meeting the quality metric. Whatever the scale is we ultimately end up on.

So my first question to the group is: Are there any other tools, resources that you would like to see added to the appendices?

>> LISA JOHNSON: This is Lisa. I have a question. Going through this list, it made me immediately wonder about assessment tools for regular supervision and evaluation of service providers. I'm wondering who would be doing that supervision and evaluation, because I'm not sure that a typical building administrator who does, you know, the routine yearly evaluations of teachers would have the training and the expertise and the knowledge to evaluate the effectiveness of these providers.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right. And I agree. That's why I mention I want to come back to this one. I personally think that this one should not be here. I think that all Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind providers have a supervisor. And that supervisor should be doing their annual evaluations. So I don't know if Jen and Tracy want to weigh in on that.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I would agree within UVMCC, I can speak for myself, have our own internal evaluation, yearly evaluation process that happens. And I would -- well, I can't speak to if the others are. That's happening within their organizations as well.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. So Sherry's not here to edit this, but I will take a note to take that one off of our list. I don't know how it wiggled in there, but it did.

>> LISA JOHNSON: So this is Lisa. I will be quiet, I promise. It's a personal flaw. I would love to see us try to build in ownership from general education building administrators and teachers, though, so that they would be encouraged to have some domain and expertise in some capacity in there. If they are able to say, oh, I don't have to worry about that person because somebody from an outside agency is going to take care of that. So I don't need to educate myself or build any capacity within myself to understand this student's needs or this student's role in this educator's role in my building. Then it just so completely takes gen ed off the hook which I see so frequently here.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes. This is Sharon. As a parent of a child with a profound hearing loss, I heard that so many years in a row where a teacher would say, oh, I don't need to attend this session. I've had a kid in my classroom before who was Hard of Hearing. And it is beyond less than professional and acceptable. From lots of perspectives. But I'm going to let Jacqui speak to what strategies and avenues we have available to do that without --

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. When you read the appendices list and it clearly says a colation of evaluation tools that reflect best practices, I didn't have heartburn with F. We're not saying these are the tools that are required. But particularly long-term down the road this is something that could be a very valuable instrument for our districts, that might be contracting with service providers and what are some best practices that we should be looking at in what we should be expecting in this service

provider.

So maybe the word is assessment tool. Maybe it's list of qualities and characteristics. I think assessment tools are cleaner, but that's why I didn't say anything about it, because we're not saying this is what you will use. This is best practice.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: That's my opinion.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. I guess I would offer that under number four we have definitions for qualified providers and professionals. And under that category, that defines who should be providing these services and who is trained adequately to the sufficient level to be providing these services. So I don't think a principal or a gen ed teacher needs to be evaluating the Deaf, Hard of Hearing provider per se which is how I read F. Rather, I would take it from Lisa's perspective that the gen ed teacher should be educated by the provider to have stake in providing and creating a great educational environment for these kiddos.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Just a quick caution. In terms of assessment of gen ed teachers. So that's a contractual obligation. That's a union -- I mean I don't have an opportunity to negotiate how I will evaluate. That's part of a negotiated agreement. So I think we have to stay out of the gen ed domain. Because every district has their own contract, has their own agreement, and it's unionized. We don't have a domain in that piece. So I think just be very cautious.

I think in terms of service providers, we can talk about some opportunities, but again, it's recommendations we can't mandate that.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah.

>> LISA JOHNSON: So this is Lisa. I just put in the chat. What about a documentation of collaboration between general education and specialized service providers?

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. So under number ten, guideline number -- actually, it's not number nine. There's a lot, Lisa, about the collaboration. We need strong state leadership and collaboration amongst state agencies including the agency of education, school districts, Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind providers and so forth and so on to create some of those collaborations and therefore some of the education and connections. Yes. Yeah. So it's there.

So other things that would be helpful here? Other resources that SPED ed directors or -- that would be helpful? Anyone?

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: This is Amelia. Under the qualified providers, couldn't you just -- we would link to the transcript for TOD.

>> SHARON HENRY: I'm sorry. Say that again, Amelia.

>> AMELIA BRIGGS: From the AOE, it's a transcript review work sheet. Endorsement number 68, teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. So just goes through all of the different things that they're looking for in order to --

>> SHARON HENRY: Could you send me that link? And I think the other thing, I was looking to Jen and Tracy, you know, on your professional associations and what is your educational -- do we just need to list here your Vermont license? I mean, I don't know enough about your world.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. Yeah, I would say that there's the Office of Professional Regulation licenses audiologists. And then there's two licenses for speech language pathologists. One through the Office of Professional Regulation. One through the Agency of Education. So I don't know if we could just -- I think I sent you links to those agencies.

And the other thing that would be even simpler for SLPs and audiologists is to say that they need to have their certificate of clinical competence. Because -- well, I think you still have to have a license, though, in Vermont. You can't just have that. You have to also have a license.

>> SHARON HENRY: And what about a TODHH?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I mean, you could -- we could certainly link to the endorsement TOD endorsement. I don't -- I can't remember if I talked to you about this before or not. But the TOD -- the teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing endorsement is -- well, I don't know. It's unique, because it says that -- I mean, as we know in the field of Deaf education, there are huge differences between maybe a child that is just using listening and spoken language and what qualifications a teacher of the Deaf would need to support that student versus a student that is using, you know, primarily ASL. And yet there's only one endorsement. There's one teacher of the Deaf endorsement.

Yeah. So I mean -- but in terms of -- I mean, that's the first qualification they need to have to be a licensed TOD. And then -- you know, having experience on top of that. I guess I'm not totally sure how to -- I don't know. I'd have to think. I'm not sure how we would lay that out. I mean, in general saying they have to be licensed TOD, that is what the requirement is. That you have to be a licensed TOD. But just knowing that there is still different experience that's required depending on the student's needs.

>> SHARON HENRY: And Jen, licensed by whom?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: The Agency of Education.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So I might circle back to you for those links. Jen and Tracy, do either of you have a template for your classroom observation, your educational session for gen ed teachers, or a template for your functional evaluation of a classroom?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I mean, I think that yes in the past we have had a template for classroom observation. We could certainly -- but I would want to get feedback from other providers as well. I do wish that everybody was -- we had all providers at the table, because I think it would be necessary to get feedback from everybody. And in terms of a general ed session, I assume that means what we often use to call a sort of in service at the beginning of the year or beginning of a semester or

if there's new equipment. I do think that -- but it's kind of difficult, because it depends -- I mean, I would say we could give a basic one. But it's going to depend on what exactly needs to be covered. So it's not -- but I guess it could be a starting point of the sort of basics that need to be covered.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Can you send those both to me, please?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yep.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thanks. And then Tracy, did you have a comment?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah. I think there may be also some of these observation forms through the educational audiology handbook which was just revised. And they have some really good suggestions in there. So I can look through that and see if something would -- it could be an option, not a requirement. Here's an example of. Is that what you're thinking?

>> SHARON HENRY: Exactly. Because up above, we ask for evidence of these classroom observations. Well, would be nice if we could provide a template. I think a SPED ed director might want to reach for these in the absence of any other resources.

>> TRACY HINCK: And there's also a great one for classroom acoustic analysis. So I'll send you those. And --

>> SHARON HENRY: Please do.

>> TRACY HINCK: They've already been peer reviewed. They've been peer reviewed and published.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. And who can send me the proficiency test for ASL interpreters?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I can.

>> SHARON HENRY: Was that Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah. Sorry.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Awesome. Okay. We're going to come back to this list next week. But right now I want to move on and Jen, I'm going to skip over your Colorado report and move to Jacqui and have Jacqui lead us through the feedback that her stakeholders have submitted both in writing and then invite Lisa and Dawn if they're still on the call to provide any other feedback or guidance to us.

And then one other question I had for Jacqui. Was there someone coming on June 1 next week? A Cassie -- I'm spacing on the last name.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: No. I responded to the email that we did not have someone on June 1st. Dawn and Lisa are willing to come back on June 7th. I'll do what I can. I'll be honest, I'm struggling a little bit. My son with autism just tested positive for COVID, and I'm trying to help regulate a little bit. So I'm a little bit scattered at the moment. Always a mom.

So I'm not able to share. Cassie sent us information. We're trying to figure out how to get her comments out of the document that I can see them but she gave a prolific amount of comments. And I have not been able to collate them. Dawn and Lisa

are here. They could speak to their perspectives for a moment, and then I'll pull up what Dan had to share with us. So Lisa and Dawn, if you could give your overarching comments to the review you provided.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Sorry, Jacqui. You're talking about just the feedback we gave in the email? Or just about the --

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yes, please.

>> LISA JOHNSON: Yeah. I think I've mostly brought up the things that I added. For me, most of my comments centered around documentation and being explicit and purposeful in the IEP process. And then I had some suggestions about mandating -- and I know Vermont doesn't like that word. But specific types of training or training hours needed in different domains. You know, universal design for learning, those kinds of things. I've been in special education for 25 years, and I know probably the least about this particular population because it's lower incidents. And I even have a master's in lower incidents. I'll check the email I sent to see if I forgot anything that I remembered previously. But I'm really grateful to have been invited to get to participate.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. Thank you so much, Lisa, on -- I hope you can stay in touch. I hope you can come back on June 7th. And I also wanted to connect you with some people at the University of Vermont where I was recently a retired faculty member in physical therapy. They're starting a Ph.D. program to create leaders in education. And Laura and I have been having discussions between ourselves about the need to teach these -- have content in such a program that would teach teachers about this population.

So maybe you and I can connect on the side.

>> LISA JOHNSON: I would love that. I'm very interested.

>> SHARON HENRY: Great, great. And Dawn, could you please add your comments as well?

>> DAWN CAMPBELL: Yeah. I agreed with what Lisa had said and really just wanted to be here to learn as much as possible and really appreciative to be here with this group. Thank you.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Good. Sharon, I can go ahead and just, like, review some of what Dan had to say. And Dan is a paraprofessional who has supported children with Deafness. Reading through the document, he just -- you know, his initial things was he had -- you know, he had some questions, but he didn't get back to me with additional questions. He thought for him that some of the language was hard to understand. Almost like looking for a glossary or a key for some of those things. He said maybe it was just him and his lack of knowledge. But he really hoped that we would include an emphasis on training for paraprofessionals who might be supporting the child one-on-one or small groups. I know we talk about training. He noted that in some cases we're specific about faculty staff. He wants to make sure that that also includes that para that might be involved in that programming.

He said consultation with general education teachers. In his experience, this is a huge need. And I think we've heard Lisa suggesting that at several points in our meeting today. He also said there needs to be effective communication and collaboration among everyone supporting the child and said how critical it is for folks to be on the same page and to be working together with consistency.

In our appendices, maybe list resources, a district. And he said, you know, a para like him could go to to understand the characteristics of the disability, the culture, the family needs. And then finally he said for families, do we need to write something about access? And then in parentheses he said translators or interpreters and communication in the language parents understand. Identifying and recognizing families' strengths. Include the expertise of families since they're the best information resource about the child, family, and their culture. They're partners in setting goals and finding solutions. Should be written in a way that family knowledge and experience is equally as important. So that was the end of Dan's feedback. Any thoughts or questions?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. So I have a question. Jen and Tracy, when you do your services at the beginning of the semester, are only professionals invited?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. We try to emphasize that anybody that is working with the student on a regular basis should be there. But it doesn't always happen. That's just the reality. It does not always happen. But we do try to encourage everyone that's working with the student regularly to be there.

>> SHARON HENRY: So this is Sharon. Maybe we can strengthen some of the language in our document to emphasize the importance of not only inviting everyone, but strongly encouraging them to attend. I realize scheduling is an issue. Tracy, did you have a comment?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah. I was just going to reiterate what Jen said. We always try to invite people. And sometimes we're lucky if even the teachers come. Sometimes I go back out and meet with other staff that weren't able to attend the meeting. And I do find that really helpful. Oftentimes the parent is the person on the ground responsible for the daily check. So I think that's a really, really food point. It would be nice to make that more -- a little stronger language in the tool.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> LISA JOHNSON: This is Lisa. I think that was amazing and fantastic feedback from a paraprofessional. Wow. And coming from Texas where cultural competence is a big issue as well as bilingualism. I think it's really great that he's focused on that. And I think that it's important to look at culture on multiple layers, because this child might have -- come from a different cultural background, but also please correct me if I'm wrong, those who are in the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community, there's some cultural pieces there that need to be considered.

And then I also -- once again coming from a Texas lens, we -- an IEP



meeting is not a legal IEP meeting. It cannot be held without those required members at the table. So if a meeting is held without a teacher of students of those with impairment, then the meeting might as well not happen because it doesn't count. And general education teachers have to come and they have to stay the whole time and you have to have somebody from career and technical education. I don't know if that's just a Texas thing or if that's something that would be considered as a requirement.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. I'd have to defer to Jacqui, because she knows the law. Jacqui, do you have an opinion on that? Or insights on that?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: No, Lisa's right. And there is a form that can be filled out if somebody is not going to be in attendance. And the parent has to agree to that.

>> LISA JOHNSON: And in Texas it can't be a core member. You wouldn't be able to excuse the AI teacher. You wouldn't be able to excuse the gen ed teacher. You would only be able to excuse the related service provider or psychologist or something.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah, for here the parent has to consent to a core member being absent. And that core member is -- I don't know if it's required or encouraged. I could check that one. But the expectation is that person is at least in writing providing an update and providing feedback and input in their absence.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So thank you, Lisa, for your comment. We're just about at time. Was there someone else who had a short comment?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah, well, this is Jen. Just as you're talking, it's really sort of -- and I don't know if this is the right time to bring this up. But something we see a lot is that interpreters are not invited to IEP meetings. And as a related service provider, they really should be. Just as you were talking, that just sort of reminded me that that is an ongoing battle that we have to try to get them to the -- invited to the IEP meetings. They're we the kids every day.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right.

>> LISA JOHNSON: They're required members in Texas, yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: So let us bring the meeting to the close to respect everyone's time. We'll see you next June 1st. Thank you, all, so much for your input. We'll be in touch by email. Again, if you can go through the document again before Friday or Saturday and add your comments, we'll discuss those on the first and then on the seventh we'll have Lisa and Dawn back again if you are available.

So have a great day and don't hesitate to shout out if there's anything else that you need. Okay? Thanks, everyone.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sharon, did you want to just check in for a minute? I have about two minutes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sure. Everyone else can sign off.