

REALTIME FILE

DAIL

School-Age Subcommittee Meeting

April 25, 2022

CART CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:

WHITE COAT CAPTIONING

* * * *

This is being provided in rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * * *

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm trying to get my screen set up, so when we go into the meeting, I have everything I need.

>> This is the interpreter, any way we can allow multi-pin for myself and for Virginia?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: This will be good. Are you able to see the multi-pin?

>> Let me try. Yes, thank you.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I do have a quick question for you, Sherry. So, I wrote you the AOE, asked if there was any oversight on ASL, and they said a district could create a position of someone to be a floater to teach ASL at multiple schools. Is that something that you could do?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: One more time. So, they are saying a district could hire a position to teach American Sign Language?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Yeah, because there's not enough -- for example, if one school was to hire a teacher, there won't be enough students to take the class. So, it won't be a good investment for one school to hire one teacher full time. Because right now -- whenever I teach, I have one student.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Wow.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Then I found out there were several schools in Washington County with a lot of ASL students, but their teachers don't know ASL. And I'm like, so, there's no oversight. There's no -- nothing.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: That's interesting. So, is there licensure for -- I guess not. I'm trying to think about --

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I had to email them. They said you have to be licensed to teach ASL under the modern and classical language something.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. So, you would need to have a license to teach ASL in a public school?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Uh-huh.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And they are saying that they don't have enough students to -- you don't have enough students.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: That's just what I know. It's what I've seen. It's what people through the grape vine have told me.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. So, if you were going to offer an ASL class to students for credit, you would need to be a licensed teacher in Vermont for that area. And, so, what you see happening is people are teaching ASL, who don't have that license?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I don't. I'm teaching and I don't have a license.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Where are you -- who are you teaching to?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Main program. Branching Out mentor program.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, I think what they are saying is that in order to award credit at a public high school, you need to be a licensed teacher.

Right, but are you awarding high school credit?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Not me, my supervisor, but I'm the one that teaches it.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I don't know. That's tricky. I mean, in any other area, sometimes people teach under other's licenses, but that's pretty rare. You would need to be working on your license to be a teacher.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I don't want to. I prefer they hire someone's who's licensed to teach ASL, not me.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Jen, any thoughts?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Sorry, I joined -- I was on a phone call, I apologize. I'm not sure exactly what you're talking about. Sorry.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, I think Laura is teaching ASL to high school students. And she doesn't have a license, and she's teaching under someone else's license. Is that correct, Laura?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: But it's not really a license. I'm teaching through a mentor program. So, that's why I'm --

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: But it's not for credits. It's just more like a club? Sorry, I won't sign. It's more just like a club, or -- it's not for -- it's not for foreign language

credits is it?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: They get credit, yeah, foreign language credit, not through me, even though I'm the one teaching it.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: That's -- so, that's tricky. And if it's by the Agency of Education, that would not be allowed. So, be careful. But good question, Laura. And, again, how do we find those individuals, I think it's going to be challenging. Hi, Jacqui, welcome.

I think that's the issue we're all having, is recruiting highly trained, licensed individuals. Anywhere, whether in a small state of Vermont or large state of Massachusetts. We are in dire straits of having highly trained, experienced individuals to fill any kind of special education or intensive needs positions.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah, and Laura is already -- she has connected with our two licensing folks, who are great. Because from my perspective, you know, I just have the piece, where if you are a gen ed teacher who's not licensed in special education, you can do special education, but must be under the supervision of a special ed, you know, teacher, administrator, you know, somebody with that license, you know, who designs, you know, designs the program, and then the gen ed teacher can implement. And then it gets a little even more complicated, as most of you know on the phone, you know, Medicaid will only pay the gen ed teacher at the pa ra rate and not at the teacher. All sorts of things.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Laura, you can always call me if you want to talk some more. Let's start our meeting. I want to open the meeting. It's 3:06. Welcome, everyone. We've got a lot of work to do, and I want to be respectful of your time.

Sharon will be joining us, so she's at another meeting that she needed to do, but she will be joining us, I think, later. I want to welcome some new participants. Tracy Evans, I'm going to say it wrong, Tracy, Luiselli? "Lou-sell-y." Introduce us to the team and let us know about yourself, please.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Sure, I'm Tracy Luiselli-Evans, and I'm the director of the New England Consortium for DeafBlindness. I'm also a teacher of the visually impaired, so that's the general domain that I come from, but I have my master's from the Boston College Program in DeafBlindness and my doctorate in early childhood specializing in social skills interventions. I've been with the New England Consortium now, I think, close to 23 years. Sad to say, on some levels. But we are a federal grant, and we work in Connecticut, Maine,

Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. So, I would say that I'm -- I've been reading through some of your documents. I kind of have an idea of what direction this group is going in, but I'm not quite sure. So, I'm definitely -- I need some learning here, as I connect with you folks here this afternoon.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Well, thank you so much for coming. We truly appreciate in having your level of expertise in our conversation. Would it be helpful for each of us to introduce ourselves?

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: That would be wonderful, thank you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm Sherry Sousa, the co-chair for this subcommittee, I'm currently Superintendent of Windsor Central Supervisory Union and director of student support services in Vermont and a special educator for over 30 years. Welcome, Tracy. Others of our team, jump in. Go ahead, Jen.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Unmute myself. I know Tracy, but I'm Jen Bostwick, teacher of the Deaf, and I work with a Deaf, hard of hearing, DeafBlind educational services program, which is part of UVMCC. And, yeah, serving kids around the state, who have needs.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Jen. Laura?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Hi, everyone, my name is Laura Siegel, I'm the director for deaf and hard of hearing and DeafBlind services here.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Laura. And Rebecca?

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Hello, I'm Rebecca. I'm the director for DVAS. Virginia, do you have that?

>> Deaf Vermonters Advocacy Services. And serving Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and DeafBlind children, all the way through adulthood. And work with Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind children who are within the school system as part of my work.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Rebecca. Jacqui?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: I'm Jacqui Kelleher, I'm the state director of special education in Vermont. And also the parent of four grown kids with disabilities, who have been through the public school system.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Jacqui. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm Tracy Hinck, I serve on the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind Advisory Council as a service provider. By training, I'm an audiologist and a speech language pathologist licensed in Vermont, New Hampshire, and I have an educational credential from California, as well. And I'm on the subcommittee. Right now I'm working a few different jobs. One is

the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program part-time at UVM and work in New Hampshire and other things. But I'm also happy to be part of this subcommittee and this work.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Tracy. We have some outstanding interpreters, and we have an outstanding captioner. We will, Amelia, who may be joining us later, I know she has some coverage issues at home, and Dr. Sharon Henry, who is the other co-chair, who will be joining us soon. We have a lot of work. So I'm going to pull up Sharon's PowerPoint. Hopefully, I've done my homework, and this will work. There we go.

All right. So, we have created an agenda for today. There we go. We've done our welcome and introductions. I'm going to change this up just a little bit. Okay, and I'd like to first see if we could have a motion to accept the summary from April 4th. I'm going to walk through that summary quickly. We're then going to do the majority of our time working through the draft of the Quality Standards and the questions and recommendations people have provided thus far. We have some other updates that people have, for information they've collected since our last meeting. We have some dates for our stakeholders, and then we'll have a quick reflection.

So, just to give an overview and to kind of highlight for Tracy what we've been doing. Yeah. Last time we met, on April 4th, we talked about how do we accomplish this assessment that has been required to us by the state of Vermont. And, so, what I brought to the group is a model that superintendent school districts use called the Educational Quality Standards. Vermont has defined what are the standards that we as public schools need to address as we develop our programming and services for our students. I'm going through this process right now with my district, and I thought if this works for school districts in order for us to document the quality of our programming, wouldn't this be an interesting parallel for establishing quality standards for programming for our Deaf, hard of hearing, DeafBlind individuals. How do we use the NASDSE guidelines, which is pretty much the national standard and is actually even referred to in the grant application for the state funding. So, that was the conversation that we had last time we met. So, we agreed to include quality standards that highlight the primary requirements for Vermont programs offering services. We agreed that we provide examples of what the evidence might look like, and, again, we can draw from what is modelled for us in the Vermont Educational Quality Standards. We will need to create an evaluation scale to judge the quality and merit of the

evidence submitted. We'll need to create a possible list of suggested clinical tools. So, what are the best practices that we know and can offer. And then we should include the nationally agreed upon definitions in terms of teacher of Deaf or education audiologist.

So, before we move forward, can someone make a motion to accept this summary, so that then will be posted on the website?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: This is Jen, I move to accept the summary.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Can someone else second that?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Second.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you. All in favor. Thumbs up. I can't see everyone's thumb.

Okay. So, majority has it. Laura Siegel, thank you, Laura, your thumbs up. So, the summary statements have been approved, and, so, now we can move them. I know Laura has been wanting to post these.

Any questions or concerns in terms of these, the summary statements?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: This is Jacqui. I think what I'm trying to get my head around is that when we're talking about programs and services, are we talking about, you know, everything that currently exists, from the LEA level, to, you know, programming that might be offered to parents through a provider? I know that the charge is about assessing programs, services, resources, and opportunities. I believe I got that language right. But, you know, how this was, you know, I'm trying to see, like, I guess I'm confused a little bit by the purpose of the document and the planned utilization, if it's going to be -- if the vision is all programs in Vermont, versus as I got to Page 6, it seemed to be focused on the grant-sponsored program. So, I'm just saying, before posting, if I was a public citizen just reading on the agreements, I would want to know, like, the intent of the scope of this work, how far reaching it is, you know, has been determined. Does that make sense? Am I making sense?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yes, Jacqui. Not only will there be a summary, but the transcript of our conversation of the meeting. And my understanding, and correct me, team members, who were here last week. My understanding is that the first of this pilot would be used -- those positions that are receiving grant funds from the state. So, start with those programs that are already receiving funding. If other programs that are offered in our state want to be posted on the AOE website as meeting quality

standards, they may also agree to submit. So, that's where we were kind of moving, first piloting with those receiving grant funds. You know, similar to, for example, special education money, IDEA, or title money. There are certain assurances that I need to make and agree to in order to receive federal funding. I also need to do that with state grants. There are certain assurances, certain pieces that I need to -- and there's a quarterly review. Right now there's an EST, an education equity grant that the state provides. So, I am required as someone receiving that money to meet with them once every quarter to review whether I'm meeting their expectations.

And, so, this is a similar parallel. It's often done with great grant money, both state and federal, where there's certain benchmarks that you have to demonstrate you're meeting in order to receive funding. So, I think the group believed that the first step would be to create the standards, apply them to situations where state money is provided. And then if there are other providers of programs outside of the LEA, outside of our public schools, but outside providers, they could solicit or become part of the standards and solicit their evidence in order to be, you know, whether it's a website or something where they could be listed as meeting the Vermont state quality standards and programming for the Deaf, DeafBlind, Hard of Hearing. So, I think phase one was creating this document, applying it to state funding for programs that receive -- that are servicing students with Deaf, DeafBlind, Hard of Hearing. Not public schools, but those providing services, and then if other programs who are also being -- which would be good for, as a special ed director, to know which programs have been demonstrated as competent in meeting the needs and standards. That would have been really helpful. There are many, you know, there are groups that are providing services, but there's no way to establish whether that's quality programming. My understanding, that was the intent of the legislation. How do we establish if this is quality programming. I think that's the orientation the group was coming from, Jacqui.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Okay. And then, finally, is this going to be shared -- the council reports to the legislature, essentially, with recommendations. So, is the intent making these recommendations to them? Or directly to the agency? I don't know if that's in the slide presentation that you're talking about, as far as the package, like the end goal is to recommend that this be adopted. I don't know what language has been used, but is that part of the slide, like the ultimate, at

the end of the day, we're going to make these recommendations to the legislature -- legislative members that these are our recommendations?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, my understanding, and, again, we can clarify this, that we have been tasked to find an assessment tool that can be used to identify quality programs. My understanding is this does not go back to the legislature, that it goes to AOE, as the process for identifying what is quality programming for this population. So, I think that's a fine grain that we can get to, as we get closer. I think we want to spend the majority of our time looking at this tool. And, again, as we work through it, as a viable tool. We can figure out the process and work with the council and go back and get some clarity on that. But for now, the work of today is to really begin to flesh through how these NASDSE quality assurances can be formed to quality standards for our programs, and, thus, benefiting our students. I'm looking at the rest of the council. Is that accurate, or are there other thoughts?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I would say I think that is accurate. That's how I'm understanding it. Yeah, in terms of where -- who we would be recommending this to or for, I guess I'm not sure if -- you know, your question, Jacqui, if it's going to the AOE or legislators. I guess I'm not 100% sure. Maybe both is what I would say. I think it could be helpful for both, I guess I would say.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. So, we now have a summary of the minutes. So, we can pass those on to you, Laura, for posting, as well as the transcript, so we have the full content, as well as the surrounding documents. So, if people wanted greater clarity, we have that piece.

Okay, I'm going to go close this up a little bit. So, this is the point in the meeting where we're going to roll up our sleeves, and we're going to get to work. So, I'm going to stop sharing this, and I'm going to try to share -- I had it lined up. Let's see. All right. The other document. So, here we go.

So, what I'd like to do -- go ahead, Jen.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Can I just jump in? Tracy Luiselli-Evans, does that help you have a little bit better picture of what we're doing as we move forward into looking at the document?

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: I think so. If I understand this correctly, you're looking at having some sort of assessment process in which to evaluate, perhaps even monitor, programming

as it relates to programs for students who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, or DeafBlind. And that tool should be tied to the NASDSE guidelines. That's the only major question I had with that, of where NASDSE comes in, and is that sort of the overarching entity that you want to have connected to this work.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Tracy, that's a great summary. You did much better than I did.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: And I would say that, yes, the NASDSE guidelines are really at the core of this document. If you're familiar with it, the Chapter 9, which is -- I think it's called "The Program Review Checklist." So, it's really for programs that really want to sort of reflect and review the programs and services -- the services that they are offering to their Deaf/Hard of Hearing students. So, that's really what we used as the, really, you know, the core of this program. I'm sorry, the document.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Go ahead, Tracy. Sorry. Tracy, you need to unmute.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Which Tracy, I'm sorry.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy Hinck. Yeah, I think to go along with that, it's on a broader scope than just the NASDSE guidelines. We're really trying to address the questions that are in the statute about the programs. And, so, what we did is we aligned those that also the NASDSE guidelines addressed. So, we have some evidence behind what we're looking at. And I think the other piece is that we're not just looking at children that are in special education. We're looking at programs and services and opportunities for children across the state that are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and DeafBlind, irrelevant of what program they are being served under. So, I just wanted to clarify that a little bit.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Tracy Hinck. All right. Okay, let me close that up a little bit.

So, the first questions were, and I think, Jacqui, you're anonymous. How do these standards align and/or intersect with the Education Quality Standards for all. Do you want to expound on that, rather than me reading what you wrote?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah, I don't even -- it seems like a lifetime ago in reviewing this, but it was much of what you were saying, Sherry, how does this intersect with EQS. Oops, I can't get out of here. Getting into the standards piece, the standards being the foundation from which programs or districts, you know, they use these standards as the basis for the development and selection of curriculum, methods of instruction, locally

developed assessments, confidence skills taught in school. That was my thinking, you know, EQS is what, you know, in IDEA, it talks about, you know, the education standards that all students are held accountable to. You know, that's their concern, what are we doing to ensure that students with disabilities have access to EQS. And, so, you know, the role I play in special ed is to, you know, be asking those questions. And, so, that led to what is the intersectionality with these standards in EQS, which is our baseline for looking at, you know, children and youth with IEPs and their programming.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Well, I think, Tracy, and Jen did a good job describing. These are what, if we're using NASDSE as our basis, and if these are nationally accepted practices, then the expectation is a program adhering to these, then we can say it's a quality program. So, what I've done is I've taken NASDSE and portions that I thought were irrelevant to programs, and, again, there's more here than we can ever expect a program to respond to. And, so, I think if we can answer our questions today, and then go back and address any concerns, then we can go back and start editing to what are those core elements to ensure a quality program. So, you think we've addressed your concern, Jacqui? Because I think, you know, we could spend the majority of our time debating any individual assessment tool. We have not found a single assessment tool that we feel can meet what we're required by legislation to provide. What we do know is NASDSE is the standard. And if we use the standard to create our quality standards, then I think we have a good way of moving forward in this work. Again, it's a model that the Vermont AOE is using for us to prove the quality of our educational programs. If that's a model that Vermont AOE is, you know, not only purporting, it's in legislature, then it seems like a quality standards model is one we could parallel in our work for this project.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Sherry, this is Tracy. I have a question.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sure.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: I'm just curious. I did a little sleuthing. I'm just curious what document you're working from when you talk about NASDSE guidelines. Because when I go to -- hold on.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Jen said this is from Chapter 9. So, I took Chapter 9.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Chapter 9, okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I basically copied and paste. I was on an airplane between Phoenix and Boston and did a lot of copying and

pasting. And what I tried to do is frame it from that language in terms after bullet kind of format.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Tracy speaking again. When I looked at Chapter 9, it just seems so thorough, and it also had the evaluation measurement aspect to it, as well. So, I'm just trying to understand, I think, where you want to go next from this. Because it seems very comprehensive.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Well, I think we have a number of questions. So, members of the council have gone through and made notations in terms of questions and clarifications.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I thought today we'd go through and answer people's questions, so we're on the same page. I think eventually, because this is pretty long, we want to be realistic. Are these the right elements, are we overextending our expectations, so that we can get to a point where we have a set of standards that are ensuring that we're meeting that legislative expectation, as well as and then for our steps after, what would be evidence of each of these standards that we would be asking for, you know, need a link to this, show me this, show me that, as well as our definitions. There were some questions and concerns around who would be doing the, you know, if the documentation comes in, who's assessing where they would fit on that scale. So, there's a lot of work here to go, but this was our first -- this was a really rough draft. So, our goal today was really to work through the comments and questions, and then hopefully move forward from there.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Thank you, thank you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Absolutely. The more we can talk through it, the better we're going to move forward.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Sorry, this is Jen. Are you questioning why we're not using Chapter 9, is that what you're questioning?

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Yes.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I think that, like Sherry said, I think we thought, you know, 40 pages or I forgot the number. A lot of pages. We're trying to pare it down to it's a little bit more manageable. And I think also looking at what is the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind service provider's responsibility, versus the district, you know, the school district's responsibility. And that we're finding is going to be -- is very difficult, I think, to piece out and pare out, but that's where I think we're starting. Does that make sense?

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Really helpful, thanks.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: You bring up a good point, Jen. I think the majority of districts in Vermont, because this category is such a low incidence disability, are the majority of time contracting out. So, the challenges for a special ed director or special ed case managers, how do we know what are quality services, because that is not our training for the majority of the students we work with. And, so, if we can hold external programs to these standards, then we have a higher probability as public school and school districts to meet the same expectation. We start our meeting with Laura, there are unlicensed people doing different kinds of things. It would be really helpful for special ed directors to have a set of vetted group of individuals and programs to provide services, so we know that we're getting high quality program meeting the needs of our students. That's the challenge, because special ed directors like myself, you know, very limited experience. People are changing constantly. Programs are changing constantly. How do I know it's a good program? So, this is an attempt to start working on that and provide that resource to special ed, to families, to program directors, how do we get that information.

All right, Laura, is your next question on our list of questions -- I'm going to say thank you to that one. Whoops. And then, so, Laura, you were asking about evidence. So, when you said evidence, can you clarify examples? So, in the Educational Quality Standards, for example, one is personalized learning. So, an example of personalized learning at a school level is submitting our course of studies. What are the classes students can take. So, what we would go through, once we've listed out our standards, our group will go back and say what would be an evidence of cultural -- pulling off from what I'm reading right here, what would be an evidence that cultural values and goals of the student and his or her family are represented and integrated in the services and programs offered. So, what could we ask from a program that would be supportive of that as evidence. That might be really challenging. So, that might be one of the standards we may need to move away from. And, so, the overall standard here is around services individualized to the needs of each student for full engagement. And we might need to see meeting minutes, which reflect that the impact of -- that the student's hearing status is considered. So, what we may want is just a sample of meeting minutes that demonstrates that was part of the conversation that happened. So, we will have to work through each of these standards and see if it's can we qualify that expectation to a specific piece of evidence. But it might

be meeting minutes, it might be agendas, it might be all kinds of things that we could ask for that would show that this program is demonstrating that.

Laura, does that make sense?

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Yes, I think so.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, I think each element will have a different kind of evidence, and we're going to need to work through that as a group to make sure that's a high-quality piece of evidence for that individual standard. Keeping --

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Sorry, I don't know if you can see me. This is Jen. Just a question. Could another example of that be through family surveys? Where you're gathering, you know, if you do yearly family surveys, and that is, you know, you're trying to capture that in a question, you know -- I can't think of a good question right now. But where you maybe have a question that is around the cultural, you know, piece, especially, you know, for Deaf community or something like that, Deaf identity. Is that something where you could maybe include parent, you know, data that you've collected from a survey and stuff?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: You could -- so, the best way to frame that would be is that you can show evidence that twice a year, a survey is sent out that includes that question. So, that way we're not asking for survey data, but we're saying show us that you are legitimately pursuing this information, and you're doing it once a area, and your evidence is the actual survey, and you can evidence it was given out twice a year. That's a great point, Jen. I think many of these things could be captured in that, and then you will share your results to the AOE based on that survey.

And what's good about evidences is there may be multiple ways to demonstrate that. So, you can choose, I'm going to give a survey, I'm going to show an agenda. But if we give programs different ways to show the evidence, we're not defining the program, and that's what Agency of Education does for Quality Standards. Here are some samples of ways you could demonstrate in this area. Good. All right. So, yes, I'm only seeing one person at a time, so I can read my notes.

All right. Jacqui, standards in education are about meeting or making progress towards an expected outcome in applying standards to ground your work. It will lead to compliance with federal and state laws. Evidence of compliance with standards is problematic.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Not the standards are problematic, it's

not even an issue with what we have, but what we're tasked with, and I think somebody used the word "monitoring," and that's compliance and continuous improvement with respect to federal and state law. So, you know, it's one thing when the AOE has guidelines for how to educate and support individuals with disabilities, but to be talking about this kind of compliance with these standards piece, you know, it might be an act of State Board of Education that might have to have happen. It's, you know, just the way that is, I'm putting that out there, a lot of things that I did was noticing in my head that written as-is, that's the primary responsibility that we have is that monitoring for state and federal requirements. So, whether it's defined further, or whether, you know, the state board adopts it and becomes a special ed rule or something, then it kicks into, you know, the things that we monitor for. I think that makes sense. It's nothing about, you know --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: That would be true of any assessment tool that we have, correct. No matter what we select, we're going to have to be careful in our language that it's not overextended to meet -- we're not stepping on the toes of state or federal. But we have been deemed with the job of creating an assessment tool to ensure quality programming for this population of students. So, assessment means you're evaluating. Assessment means there's expectation. Whatever our assessment is, we're going to have to walk through this in terms of our application. Absolutely. But we are still given the job to develop an assessment tool.

>> Laura has her hand up.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Go ahead, Laura, thank you.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I don't know if it's relevant to talk about monitoring. So... because we were just talking about monitoring. Is that staff, are we talking about, you know, children that are being monitored, or both, or what would that entail, you know, when we use the word monitoring?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Jacqui, do you want to respond to that?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: That's -- I don't know who said that before, but someone else introduced that word, monitoring. And that's what I was just connecting to what I had heard. And, you know, I think that was maybe in the form of the question of our new colleague was asking about that, and there seemed to be agreement that monitoring might be a part of this. I've not been part of that conversation. I don't have anything additional to add, except how we monitor and, you know, what the expectations are around integrated monitoring activities that happen for students with disabilities.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: I guess I was looking back at discussions with a few parents, plus some other states have had conversations with. And many -- you know, have different ways of assessing and not really, you know, able to make a good quality decision.

There's a lot of finger pointing as I have discussions with these different entities. Some people assume licensure is enough, but not necessarily is that equal to qualification. I just wanted to share that every week it seems these things come up again and again. And I keep referring people to reach out to you, Jacqui, and I hope they are. Shoot.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Again, I've said that repeatedly, you know, to please, you know, always contact your special ed director first, but, you know, secondary is we've got that 24/7 TA line. And there's also the administrative state complaint, if there are, you know, individuals or organizations can file an administrative state complaint if they believe there is a denial of faith. And qualified workforce could also be an item. And when those things come in formally, that is when I have the leverage to be able to go and investigate within 60 days, for example. So, you know, I've been watching, I've been watching since I've been messaging to the council and others, you know, been looking for specific rises in cases by disability category. And that hasn't been the case.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And I want to -- as a special ed director, I think it's really important that we provide structures that ensure the highest quality programming. I know from my parents that I've worked with for many years, making an administrative complaint, when they know that the only place that they are getting support for their child is their school, it's really challenging. So, I'm hoping that this addresses quality needs, so that parents don't have to file administrative complaints. It takes a high level of expertise and understanding to make that kind of piece. Rebecca, please, I'm sorry.

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Yes, hold on, give me one moment. Yeah, so, about your point, Jacqui, I'm not sure, I just wanted to clarify, and I'm not sure I'm understanding, because I don't have a background in special education. I am Deaf, however. So, I know a lot about advocacy and support for parents, you know, a lot of parents do contact me about their school systems not providing access, or, you know, a good quality level education for their students. So, I just wanted to clarify and make sure I understand. If, for example, if I met, you know, with an IEP team, and we would discuss things, and a student was still not

getting certain things that they needed, like a TOD, or an educational interpreter, you know, those were denied because they don't know enough sign language or something like that, should I tell the parents to contact the special education director? Or me? I just wanted to clarify that.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Sure. We always ask, you know, have you reached out to your special ed director first, you know when our parents and families call our TA line. That's been the first point of contact, who have you met with. But our TA line is also there to, you know, listen to the situation, to guide parents on their rights. You know, even loosely describing might be a denial of faith, you know, if that qualified person who had been written into that IEP, you know, now we're talking perhaps compensatory services and some other things that the parents, you know, need to be made aware of. Sometimes we do courtesy calls to the district. Hey, we're hearing this, and we tried to informally, you know, if the parents give us permission, but, you know, other than that, for the administrative state complaint process, you know, if the parent -- and I'm a parent, too, I get it. I get it. And I know people are reluctant, and they fear retaliation. And, you know, very important factors don't file. But when they do use the system in that way, it can, you know, allow us to have the resources, and also to get the information correctly to be able to address it, you know, in a faster way. And, in fact, if they do the administrative state complaint, that's a 60-day process. The time count, it's going to be investigated during that time. But we always ask, you know, have you worked with your special ed director before you go down that road. And, you know, also suggest, you know, other folks like Vermont Family Network might have resources, information that families need. So, I don't know, Rebecca, if that answers your question, but that is what we -- that's the message --

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Yes, yes, it does. Thank you, yes.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, I want to move us back to this document. Jacqui, do you think we've addressed your questions enough? I know you've got quite a few along here. Anything outstanding that we haven't addressed in your questions, so that we can move forward with the other pieces?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah, if you wanted to take my questions offline, you know, I was able to put some time in to get caught up on Friday, and just from a special ed director for the state point of view, you know, those were just my notes on the side, and they weren't -- it was just noticings. Also some

concerns around clarity, but, you know, for the NASDSE standards, you know, again, asked about those particular standards. Their focus towards special ed. And we also know that so many of our kids are not kids with IEPs. So, you know, the standards -- some of the standards focused on special ed, how are we considering 504 planning, how are we considering all of our students, you know, regardless of 504 and IEP. Just making sure they are targeted to embrace that population. You know, full disclosure, I'm a NASDSE member. I know NASDSE very well. But it was, you know, these were explicitly written for special education.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. Anything in this section here that you want us to address specifically? I'm looking at these questions. IDEA.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Again, I did add a note in the chat, if you look at the NASDSE guidelines, they are really very closely aligned with the IDEA special considerations for Deaf and Hard of Hearing, you know, it talks about direct communication with peers and staff. It talks about least restrictive environment. A lot of what is in the NASDSE guidelines is really part of that -- those special considerations and IDEA. But I would say they are just expanded on even more in the NASDSE guidelines. I don't know if that helps. I know you asked about IDEA. I know they are -- that is certainly addressed in there. If that helps.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Welcome, Sharon, glad you made it.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you very much. I'm happy to be here at least for part of the time. Thank you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Great. So, Tracy, let me just expand your question. All Together Now recommendations to New Hampshire DOE for each student is unique. Do you want to expand on that, Tracy, what you were talking about here?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah. Sherry had reached out to me to review -- All Together Now, we're a group of professionals that were asked by the New Hampshire Department of Education to review their programs and assess and find gaps in the programs that they had. So, I tried to take information from that document and kind of apply it to what we're doing here. So, the All Together Now annual report was a two-year initiative. The goal was to provide technical assistance on the implementation of optimizing outcomes for students that were Deaf and Hard of Hearing that were the NASDSE guidelines. They pointed out a bunch of strengths. A lot of strengths, a lot of challenges. One of the strengths, they had a very passionate group of

professionals and parents and Vermont has that, as well. We're passionate about this work and want it to be done well. And one challenge they found is that parents were very frustrated at the expectation that there was so much pressure put on them to determine what was best for their kids. And that there weren't licensed professionals or TODs or audiologists on the team for the audiologist to explain the report and the technology that came from the hospital. And the TODs to determine their educational services. So, in this section one of the NASDSE guidelines, what they recommended, what this group, Cheryl Johnson and the other two people, in order to determine if each student is unique, in order to ensure FAPE, they'd have to have a licensed teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and related service providers such audiologists, educational audiologists, on the team. So, that would be the evidence, one of the pieces of evidence, to assure that the child received FAPE as they had the appropriate staff. And they found a lot of times that just wasn't the case. There were counselors and school nurses and principals determining if the child's hearing loss was important or not. Written prior notices weren't completed. Just the school nurse puts them on a 504 and no one that specializes in the unique needs of kids with hearing loss are on that team. I realize this isn't the New Hampshire document, but the people worked to figure out programs for New Hampshire, and a lot of things align with what we're trying to do in this document. I wrote as it came up in the questions, I kind of wrote where that document addressed it.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, I wonder if -- I'm trying to translate that to if you're a program providing services so our students, do you have individuals who could be representative at IEP meetings? So, I hear what you're saying. You want an IEP team or a 504 team.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Any team meeting, right.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, would you feel comfortable moving that into the draft document as evidenced statement? Is that what I'm hearing from you?

>> TRACY HINCK: I mean, I guess that's a team decision. This was the recommendation of All Together Now. So, yes, I think it's really important in working in the field for 30 years. We get consultants written into the IEP, hearing consultant, and that's not a professional. And we get hearing consultant services. That's not really a service either. I think it's very confusing to school teams, to parents, as to what the services and what the provider is. So, it's kind of like a

consultant is doing consulting. It's like, well, who's the consultant, and what are they consulting on, right. So, I do think this is something that Vermont really -- I've been sort of addressing this since I moved back to Vermont seven years ago. Historically in Vermont, when it doesn't matter who the program was, they historically had generalists, they just have a consultant, and that person may or may not be licensed, they may or may not have a lot of experience, they may have been out of the field for 15 years, and they are coming in to provide technical assistance without appropriate licensure.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Go ahead, Sharon.

>> SHARON HENRY: Hi, this is Sharon. I would echo Tracy's comment, both as a parent after child who has a severe to profound hearing loss, and also as a health care provider, to have a standardized assessment protocol for this population is absolutely critical. That would also then dictate who the providers should be in terms of licensure.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, how about we copy and paste that right there in the document, Tracy, if you wouldn't mind, and then we can sort it out in more detail once we get through our comments. How does that sound?

>> TRACY HINCK: Sure, you want me to copy that and put that in the document under Unique Needs, Section 1?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yeah, exactly where you think it should go.

>> TRACY HINCK: Okay.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How's that sound? Okay. Moving down.

Okay, Jacqui's question about 504 and IEP. That's our hope to make sure we're not differentiating between those two. Though there's some reference to Part B and Part C. I notice there's some questions there.

Tracy, question about -- we've got you time after again, in terms of this piece. Purposes of our task, perhaps making recommendations that are irrelevant to the education plan a student is on.

>> TRACY HINCK: Sherry, I might have misinterpreted what you wanted me to do with this document.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: That's okay, I'm sorry.

>> TRACY HINCK: No, or Sharon, I guess I should say. Sharon, I may have misunderstood what you wanted me to do with the All Together Now. I thought you wanted me to take from it and apply it to our document in terms of evidence and recommendations.

>> SHARON HENRY: Well, I didn't necessarily think you

needed to copy into our document yet. I wanted to direct the group to which pages to read so we could focus our reading and see if there's anything in there to be helpful to our document. You've done twice the work, Tracy, so, thank you. I think we can take some of these comments and see if the group feels they should be folded in.

>> TRACY HINCK: So, I also made another document. So, I summarized everything in the long document into three or four pages with just the summary, the strengths, the concerns, the deliverables they had, and then the recommendations based on each NASDSE guideline. If you'd like, I can share that with you, and then we can just go through the questions that are listed and address these after everyone has a chance to read the summary. Does that make sense?

>> SHARON HENRY: I think that might be more efficient. And, again, we're focusing on just pulling out of that document the things that will help us shape our assessment. Yeah. So, I think that would be an efficient way to go about it. Thank you, Tracy.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: You've done a ton of work, Tracy, thank you.

Sharon, you have a question about should these be pulled apart, do providers need to show evidence in all areas.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Well, I think this kind of gets back to what we talked about in the beginning. That's a lot. That's a lot included in that. And, so, just thinking about, you know, do those need to be separated, so that you have to show documentation or evidence around this, I guess that was just my question. It's just a lot in one bullet. So, I was questioning if that needs to be simplified, or separated a little bit, I guess, is really all I was questioning.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Go ahead, Sharon. Oh, you're on mute. Oh.

>> SHARON HENRY: Jen, this is Sharon. Do you think this would help us improve the accuracy of our assessment and improve the accountability if we pulled them apart?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I think so. Can you move it up, Sherry? I can't remember what standard we're under right now. (Reading to herself).

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Quality learning, which will impact future career plans.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Opportunities for specialized programming in areas unique --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Maybe -- I think, again, we have to look at quantity. So, maybe the first structure round, if we really are around future employment, students Deaf, Hard of Hearing,

are actively engaged in their own transition planning. Again, you can show an agenda or evidence that's the expectation. That you can show evidence that there's opportunities to modify plans, data-driven instruction and evidence-based practices are in play. I think that we're going to -- there's a lot here. And I'm wondering, it's 4:00. I wonder if each one of us took a section of this and did some editing, thinking based on conversations we've had thus far, I think we're getting clearer on what we're looking for. And maybe if we each took a chunk. Like how do we get this to a point where we can ensure -- like this is a big one, right, we've got a lot going on in this section. And we're just in number two thus far. Can we each give a try at a section, do some editing, come back to the group and present it, or is that going to be too individualized?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: When you say a section, are you meaning each take a standard? Is that what you mean?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Right. Or, here's another opportunity. I could play with, or one of us could play with -- one is pretty short. But there might be some ways to, you know, I could model one of them, and then we could see if that's a model that's acceptable. I'm trying to be -- what's the most efficient way that we can move forward, because I know our time is of essence. What do you think? Or I could take number two and play with that a little bit, just kind of don't want to make you dizzy. Two is the longest one. You can see there are six pages here, and we know -- I mean, we really need to get down to two to three pages. So, we're going to have to do some significant editing. And it may be really challenging to do that as a group. And I don't know if I have the expertise to do it, or if someone else would prefer.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Sherry, this is Tracy. I have a question. Has the group decided what format they want this in? So, you said two to three pages. But my question is, too, then if you had drop-down windows, you could really condense the amount of written information. I don't know, I've seen that in a similar document. I'm just throwing that out there, because I can see where if you do want some of those pieces related to evidence, but then it's going to make the whole document very lengthy.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think we can do drop-downs for evidence examples, but I also don't want to create an assessment tool that's preventive of collecting some information. To me it's really a dipstick. How can we get enough information on an individual program that will allow us to understand whether this

is a quality program or not. Because if it becomes too cumbersome, then no one will do it, and we won't get any assessments. So, how do we find the balance to get the right pieces of information that would give us an indicator that this program knows what it's doing in providing a quality program, but is not so cumbersome that no one does it.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Right, I've been involved in the DeafBlind NASDSE guidelines, and I can tell you no one ever uses them unless it's for dispute resolution.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Right.

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: So. It's a great document.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I think that's what we're trying -- sorry, Sharon, I just talked right over you, sorry. I think that's part of what, you know, we want. Is that we want these documents and these guidelines to be out there and better known and better utilized. I think that's part of it. We want them to be manageable, because I agree, right now it's 135-page document. It's a lot.

>> SHARON HENRY: Hi, this is Sharon. I can help with editing. But again, I would want someone with the expertise, Sharon, no, no, no way we could not have that, or we definitely need to include this. I'm trying to think of a way in my mind to make that happen, and I haven't come up with it yet.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So, in terms of public meeting law, we could probably have two people working together to make recommendations for changes. But I think other than that, it becomes an open meeting law issue. And I would love to work with someone. I would love to partner with someone, too, and schedule a meeting, and let's get down with it.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, I think maybe, Sherry, if you were to take number two, because that seems to be the sticky one, the longest one, and model that for us. And then I'm happy to work with Jen. And tackle two or three other ones. And then maybe another couple could pair up. As long as we're putting our comments in this document, so that the entire group can see it, and then we discuss it at the next meeting, does that allow us, Sherry, to be okay in terms of open meeting law?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think that would be fine. I think rather than comments, and you can see how this can be -- I would love to see a rewrite, and then we work through the rewrite. So, instead of -- you know, again, we can always go back to the history of changes, because it's a Google doc. But I think it's time where we kind of roll up our sleeves and do some of that work. And I'll take two, if somebody wants to offer to do

another section. I feel for Tracy, my gosh, she just did a ton of work. And I know how we're all so busy. So, I'll take two and work through that. And I think our intention is, if we take each of the elements, what are the core pieces that will allow us to determine whether that element is being addressed in the program. We can't have all of it. So, what's the best parts that will give us that information towards quality programming. Because I think Tracy said, again, Tracy and Jen, huge document. But it's not practical in terms of application. How do we make this a summary tool of NASDSE that actually could be used and executed. Again, what a powerful piece, because this could be replicated elsewhere. Because no one has done this heavy lifting, we're all in the same kind of program.

>> SHARON HENRY: So, I'll volunteer to do three, four, and five with Jen. If that works for you, Jen.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Anyone want to partner with me and number two?

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm happy to do that, Sherry. You want to do one and two?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Okay. Awesome. One and two. And then Sharon and Jen, you're taking --

>> SHARON HENRY: Three, four, and five.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: How about we start there, unless someone else is hot to do another part, but maybe if we just do one through five by our next meeting and see what we come up with, how does that sound for the group?

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: I'm happy to go wherever you'd like me to go.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think, Tracy, it would be really helpful if we have Tracy Evans, your lens on making sure we have the core elements that would reflect the quality standard for the DeafBlind population, because the guidelines are written for the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, as you realize.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Tracy Luiselli-Evans, did you say there are NASDSE for DeafBlind, as well?

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Yes, they were published a long time ago. I will try and get my hands on that document. I think it's electronic, and if it is, I'll send it out to you folks.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: It hasn't -- these were just updated in 2019, but the DeafBlind have not been --

>> TRACY LUISELLI-EVANS: Years ago, years ago.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: That's too bad.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: All right. So, I hear people saying that we are going to make an attempt to revise one through five, and

really identifying those pieces that are the most important. And that we could think of some evidences that go along with that. So, we come back to the group with one through five, with, let's say, the condensed version. And we think about some evidences as we do that. Sound good? Thank you. Thanks.

All right, Sharon, I'm so glad you're back. You do a much better job at this.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you. Thank you. So, this is Sharon. So, I guess we want to move on to talking about our stakeholders. Is that where we are, Sherry? Okay. So, Jacqui, since you're still on the call, you had suggested three or four names. And we already have stakeholders confirmed for May 9th, correct, Jen, John Pirone is coming May 4th. May 4th. And Rebecca was checking on Stuart coming May 9th and Kevin coming the 17th. Is that correct, Rebecca?

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Not both at the same time.

>> SHARON HENRY: No, no, no, no. So, therefore, Jacqui --

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Yes, yes, they both said they can. I'll have to look at when they can come.

>> SHARON HENRY: So, Rebecca, if you could email me privately and tell me who's coming on which date, that would be helpful. And, therefore, Jacqui.

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Yep, I will definitely do that. Oh, also, I did want to let you know, too, I had information on -- let me pull it up. Oh, information on Patty, if you wanted that, as well, I can send that to you.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, thank you. So, Jacqui, so, your three people, we have availability on May 25th or June 1st.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: To get the stakeholder feedback from the, you know, the special ed/admin practitioner, as well. So, since you have their contact information, can you arrange for that?

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Do you want me to send you their contact information? I think that was one ask, and then just send the other email that went to others? I'm not sure what the ask is.

>> SHARON HENRY: The ask is for you to take the initiative to contact them, explain why we're inviting them and have them come to the meeting.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Okay, 25th or June 1st.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, and then let me know, because we'd use the other spot for Patty Dickinson or one of our other stakeholders.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yeah. And they all don't need to be on.

I just did my homework. And that was to reach out to those folks. I know Dawn Campbell and Lisa Johnson have already said whenever you need them, they are very interested as both former teachers and current administrators about --

>> SHARON HENRY: Super, thank you so much. You can just email me privately, Jacqui, by the end of the week and update me as to where you're at and which date they've accepted to.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Yep.

>> SHARON HENRY: As I said, John Pirone is coming May 4th. And Tracy and Jen, you're probably still looking for high school students, or have you put that on the back burner for now?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I can say it's been on my back burner, to be totally honest.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's okay, that's okay. You too, Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: I reached out to one parent that has two students, and she hasn't responded.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's fine, that's fine, that's fine. I'm a little bit behind, too. I haven't had a chance to write up and share with you the feedback that I got from my college-aged student, who I contacted, and got quite a bit of feedback from her. So, I will share that with you via email.

So, I think is there anything else on stakeholders that we need to discuss? Anyone else, who we haven't discussed or forgotten about? Oh, I know what it was. When we met with Michelle John, she had suggested an audiologist who was not on the council, and she gave us Deb Rooney, Melissa Clarke, or Cynthia Knowlton. So, those are some people who we can invite. And then the other suggestion I think she made was a DeafBlind adult, Deaf adult, and a Deaf educator. Does the group feel like we should pursue those stakeholders at this point in time, or is our time better spent finishing the document, because as we discussed at our last meeting, we would like at least language in the request for applications that goes out from the AOE to say this tool is forthcoming, the person who receives the grant will be using this tool. So, how does the group want to spend our remaining time?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think it may be more helpful to have a tool that's fully vetted by us before bringing it to other groups. I think Tracy has done a great job jumping in with both feet today, but you're right, we have a lot of work to do, and it would be great to show a vetted project to then have more feedback at that point.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, okay. Our plan is the full council is meeting on May 19th. So, whatever state we are at, at that

point in time, our hope is to share it with the council at that point to also get their feedback and their support, as well. So, I think we'll just hold off. Our last set of stakeholders will be the ones that Jacqui invites, and then we'll go full guns with our work as Sherry described. So that will be great. Okay.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Sorry, Sharon, this is Jen. Sorry to interrupt. The only piece that I feel like we don't have -- that I'm a little bit concerned about under representation is DeafBlind. Adult, you know, an actual DeafBlind adult themselves. I don't know how others are feeling. That's one group that I feel like is a little bit underrepresented.

>> SHARON HENRY: What do other people think?

>> REBECCA LALANNE: This is Rebecca. Yeah, I agree. I think DeafBlind are definitely less noticed. Especially within our community, too. We always have a problem being able to provide that same amount of, you know, attention to that group.

>> SHARON HENRY: So, so, what would be an efficient way to engage -- the two names that were put forth, again, not by me, but someone else, Renee Pellerin and Kevin Richmond. How would the group like to proceed?

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I guess -- and Will Pendlebury is on the committee and he's a DeafBlind adult, himself. He will have his eyes on there and will be able to give feedback.

>> SHARON HENRY: Because he's co-chair of the full council.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: So, I guess I don't know, I could go either way. I think that's the one group that kind of sticks out, on the committee we're a little bit -- even though Tracy is here and Amelia is not here today, but she typically is. She certainly has that lens. I could go either way, I guess, sorry. Talking circles.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. Okay. So, we'll sort of hold it right there in terms of stakeholders, knowing we have Tracy Evans with us. And I think I think the only other request that I have is that by Friday, if all of you could jump back into the document and based on the discussion that happened today, either -- if there are any comments that could be resolved or clarified. There are some comments made, but weren't suggestions or alternatives offered. So, criticisms are absolutely fine and totally welcome, but I would like people, particularly you, Jacqui, let's think about it this way, or maybe I could suggest this, or is it possible to do this. So, if we could resolve any comments that can be resolved based on discussions today, and if you can clarify or offer suggestions or solutions to comments that you did provide by the end of the week, that would allow us

to move forward much more efficiently. So, is that request clear to everyone? Okay, wonderful. Wonderful.

Okay, so, I think we are at our time. So, you all have received the Zoom links for the next meetings in May and June. I think Jacqui, if you can free up your schedule to join -- I know the initial indication was you could make four of the seven or three of the seven. If anything wiggles up in your schedule, we would love to have your expertise and input, because the work will continue to move forward. You did read the minutes from last time. What the group is hoping for is that when you do send the request for applications, in there will be language that a tool is forthcoming, and whoever the award is given to will be asked and required to use this tool.

>> JACQUI KELLEHER: Okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: That would be great, thank you. Okay, so, now I'll turn it back over to Sherry for our closing reflection, and on our process. Sorry you had to be the minute taker and the facilitator, Sherry, and reflect.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Here are my minutes, it's a blank page. But I will just say, we did review and approve the minutes and the summary. So, Sharon, there's that piece. We had an extensive discussion, kind of some nice summaries about the work we've done for Tracy Evans and others. And then we began our work through each of the comments that were made on the draft document.

So, any feedback for us as a team? I know today was a good process conversation and really making sure we had shared understandings of the work. Any feedback for the group? You know, I know I didn't do as well as Sharon for this facilitation. It's hard with this group. People have a lot of input, which is great. Thanks, Tracy.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: I did not really review the Colorado document. I don't know if you want me to, or if you -- I mean, I think in a nutshell, there were a few -- there's a couple sections of the report. So, I was given -- let me back up. In 2019, the Agency of Education in Colorado, and I think the legislators, requested a external review of services provided through Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind. And then it kind of expanded to services across the state of Colorado. They looked at -- they were looking at six components within their review. They looked at on-campus instruction. Again, it was really focused on the School for the Deaf and Blind. Student academic outcomes, outreach program, early intervention, resource allocation, and per pupil spending, and oversight

accountability and transparency. And within those six components, they sort of embedded the pieces of the NASDSE guidelines, the standards of the NASDSE guidelines, if that makes sense.

So, I would say if you're going to review any of the document, and I actually -- not sure if the document, the full report, Sharon, is in our shared Google -- okay. It is in the shared Google folder. And I would say the two components that I think relate to us the most, and what we're sort of looking at, are student academic outcomes and outreach program. And those are pages 39 through 54. Some of the other is very interesting, but I would say if you're going to review any of it, as we look at -- start looking at our document, that would be probably where I would start.

I would just -- sort of a caveat. As I was reading this, I was sort of like I think that for almost every sentence you could just put -- substitute Vermont for Colorado. It was both sad and -- I don't know, I think it was just surprising, because I guess I feel like Colorado, that their deaf ed system is a pretty solid deaf ed system. And they have so many of the same struggles and, you know, challenges that we do in Vermont. I thought it was really interesting to read that. But, yeah, so, I guess that sort of in a nutshell, if you want to focus on two of their components to kind of review, that's probably where I would -- the academic and the outreach program.

>> SHARON HENRY: This is Sharon. Sorry, in coming to the meeting late, I did miss an agenda item, which was to allow Tracy, Jen, and Laura to talk about the documents they reviewed. Given we're almost out of time, maybe Laura you could share with us via email what parts of the Virginia document, if any, should be reviewed. My sense of all the documents that have come in so far, no other state is really doing a good job of assessing. Even I was unimpressed with New Hampshire, quite honestly, Tracy, even though they had Cheryl Johnson on their committee. So, I'm hoping that I can help blaze the way.

>> TRACY HINCK: You're right, this is Tracy Hinck. They made recommendations for what the state should do, but for a two-year, \$200,000, you know, they kind of pointed out what we all kind of know. And the solution was to hire someone at the DOE to oversee it. And they did some videos. I mean, they have a website with videos.

>> SHARON HENRY: And if you look at the practitioners' satisfaction with what they got, they did not rate it of high value. I'm not keen on the New Hampshire model. More

importantly, they didn't do the assessment that we are trying to do. So, if you want to recommend pages, Tracy, you know, if someone has nighttime reading they want to do, please feel free to, but we'll take the comments you put in the document and fold them in.

>> TRACY HINCK: I just picked what I thought could be used in their recommendations to provide some evidence ideas for ours. And I did summarize the whole thing and sent it to you. I changed it from the -- I made it four pages with the purpose, the strengths, the weaknesses, and the -- but, yeah, I pretty much just pulled what I thought applied. But that was just my interpretation. So, others might have different interpretations.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: So, this is Laura. It's pretty tough to summarize in just the short time we have left, but basically, I talked with the state of Virginia, and Indiana, and I asked them very directly, do you feel your states have good models, and they both said nope. The state they recommended most strongly was Minnesota. So, I've already reached out there, and I'm waiting to have them respond back. You know, I do want to do some cleanup before putting things up on the Google doc, but I did collect information from both those states. I just want to clean it up so it looks a little better, it's easier to look at. It's a little confusing how I have it now.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sorry, Sherry, that was way out of process in terms of what we're supposed to be doing right now, which is reflecting. I'm adding another agenda item, I apologize.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: This is what we need to do. We don't get to gather that much. We have really important work, and I think it's great to substantiate we are looking at other models, and we are not seeing what we need to ensure we are complying with the legislation. I think that's great, that's important, but it also really legitimizes the work we need to do, so we can become the model for the rest of the states. Exciting.

>> SHARON HENRY: So, thank you, everyone. Jen Bostick with, I'll be in touch with you to set up a Zoom time, okay. And we'll see you all on May 4th with John Pirone. So, maybe, Jen, wait until the end of the week before we send the -- before you would share the document with John, and don't give him access to the Google drive. Just download the document and email him the document. Sherry, do you have a minute to stay on?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yes, sure.

>> JENNIFER BOSTWICK: Without the comments?

>> SHARON HENRY: Comments are fine, but don't give him access to the drive. The document has been constantly changing.

Just download the document, comments and all, send that to him after Friday, after everyone has a chance to finish doing what I asked them to do by Friday.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you all. Great meeting.

(End of meeting)