

March 7, 2022

DHHDB Council The School Age Subcommittee

>> Should we leap into it?

>> I think we should.

>> Tracy, are you all set to go with the captioning?

Well, let me just pull up the link. Can you pull up the link, Sherry? It was in the e-mail -- in the Zoom invite.

>> Hang on one second. Yes.

>> So if you pull that up is the captioner ready to start?

>> Yep.

>> Thank you, Tracy.

>> She is taking our every word or he.

>> Okay. Thank you.

So thumbs up to accept the summary of our February 23rd meeting. Okay. Great. And I did your suggestion, Sherry, tighten up our discussions of our norms, but I just want to make everybody aware that our meetings are not recorded because of a technical issue. So the transcription -- the verbatim transcription will suffice as our recording of the meeting.

Okay. So we accepted our February 23rd meeting. And so to discuss all the resources, what I have done is on our -- now I'm going to share a different screen. I'm getting very fancy.

>> Well done.

>> Okay. Thank you. Can everyone see this Excel document? So on our shared Google space I created this worksheet just to keep track and Sherry over the weekend confirmed that she can add -- and one of the people that she contacted was Kym Meyer from Massachusetts. Can you just update us on your conversation with Kym Meyer that you've had so far?

>> Yes, we've kind of played a little bit of scheduling trying to connect, but essentially, she really didn't know of any rubrics or other states that are evaluating the program. There's a lot of information but not a lot of resources about how to actually evaluate programs and gaps and program and services across the state. She thought it was a great idea.

>> And she'll be happy to take whatever you come up with.

>> Yes. I'm sorry if I missed that. I was a little bit part of all together now just on the outskirts. And I've worked with Northeast Deaf and Hard of Hearing. I would be interested to know if they evaluate programs. I would be happy to reach out to Pamela Joy and see.

>> And is Pamela the contact?

>> Yes, she is the coordinator. There's also a director there.

>> Well, I don't want to volunteer you for something that you have the capacity for, but since Kym Meyer didn't go anywhere --

>> Yeah, I'm not prepared today to tell you much but I'll be happy to reach out on the next meeting.

>> That'll be great. I know Amelia was going to reach out to the Minnesota Commission and also to Tracy Evans. Tracy, Amelia has pointed out that the guidelines only covers hard of hearing I. doesn't cover deafblind. I think she's also going to reach out to Stephanie -- I missed Stephanie's last name.

Okay. Thank you. So when Amelia logs on we can see if she has an update.

>> Hi, everybody. Sorry I'm late.

>> That's okay, Jen. I told people you were coming late.

>> Yes.

>> So -- and Jacqui was next up. She was going to log on at 4 o'clock today. So she'll log on and 4:00 but looking at her PowerPoint that she sent to our subcommittee I was looking for ways that this data might be useful for our work of assessing deaf hard of

hearing DeafBlind services and I'm not sure if I could find out. So I wasn't sure if other people what they thought of it and what I might be missing.

>> So just to somewhat -- and I shared with Sharon earlier, someone as a district we've been evaluating by our 17 indicators. So this is really about disabilities overall and parent's experiences. So it really doesn't distill out. It's really a collection of all. The other issue is we've experienced that the response rate is so low that it's really hard to come to any decisions about the availability or successfulness of a program because we probably, you know, out of 120 kids we might get ten parents who respond. So it's really -- it's hard and I know directors in general find it hard to use this effectiveness in programs because there's such a low response rate.

These are families that are really struggling to keep things doing and it's just not a high priority that families complete. It's been my experience and, you know, I appreciate the state's effort to do this. And so it's really about percentage of time in the classroom and if families feel like they're an active member of the specialized team. Often the people who respond to the ones that have had the least possible experience of school. So it's hard to get a measure broadly of successful programs. The ability just to make around as DeafBlind would be really hard. Still the end is so small that it's really hard to assess program's effectiveness.

>> And so, Sherry, I didn't appreciate that all of the data that Jacqui said was based on parent response only?

>> Right.

>> Did anyone else appreciate that.

>> Yes, I don't think I realized it either. To be honest I also didn't take too deep of a dive into it. I mean, Sherry, that's been our experience that it is -- I mean, I think it is very difficult to get information that directly correlates because there's so many different factors that play into these student's services and plans. It's just -- it's difficult. And it's such a high level that makes it even more difficult to even draw a line because the lack of or the lack of the services.

>> I think it's hard to identify who actually has a hearing impairment. It's unusual for that to be listed as a secondary or if a child is young. So I know there are some efforts across the country to do a better job with data collection in terms of who actually has a sensory impairment and how that's recorded and how we can calculate that in a better way so that numbers are larger and maybe we can see trends of services and how they're written and explained and if there's a direct correlation with support services for that.

>> Well, and in terms of how we identify kids for special education services, what's primary, what's secondary -- I mean, we're going to pick our lowest hanging fruit. So while that may be a concern for the student and an issue that we're addressing in providing services I would say that's rarely that we would put that and unless that's the only issue that the student is addressing it would not be listed. And, again, as a special educator I want to make it special for them. I never -- I guess to me it was important in the process unless that was the sole issue. We're special educators that's focusing in delivering service that's appropriate.

I know one thing that the state discuss a nice job of is regularly giving district's feedback on the percentage of disability categories by categories. So do you have mostly students that are mostly disturbed and then ADHD and are you overrepresenting, but the DeafBlind really gets collapsed into that -- it doesn't even show up in terms of the special ed population.

>> So this is Sharon. Is there anything are -- are there any data available from AOE that would help us on the assessment of these kids in terms of their progress.

>> This is Sherry. Not that I'm aware of. Not that I remember seeing as a special ed director.

>> And Tracy and Jen, how do you assess your children's progress? How do you monitor their learning and say well this -- the things are working?

>> So on individual students are benchmarked and they are program monitoring. However, that data is not collected. So that's only on the student's plan. That data is never collected on the state level.

>> It's never rolled up.

>> And it couldn't because both in Vermont they use a district software. And I was one of those that said no I don't want the state to look at my IEP. So while the goals and objectives are very clear and that has to be measured quarterly and that has to be reported to the parents there's no capacity at this time for the state to collect this data.

>> I mean, in some ways I wonder if we should be looking this in a broader sense. And they should be assessing these kids in all areas of suspected disability. So for deaf and hard hearing kids they should make sure that they have specialized training. I don't know if that's our responsibility to see with whoever they contract with. As much as there is, are there programs in Vermont that are accessible that are outlined by the statute. Do we have access to deaf mentors and hearing kids with hearing loss? That's an area that there's a gap in Vermont.

I think it's a gap and we point that out. Are there teachers of the deaf? There are. Are there direct service providers? There are. Are there consultation? There's a lot of consultation in Vermont that has had an area of concern for a long time. Like why isn't Vermont providing a direct service? So I guess when I try to think about what are we trying to accomplish in this task, you know, what are we trying to accomplish? Well, we're trying to answer those questions in the statute. Are these programs out there and are there gaps? Are we evaluating that?

>> I don't go ahead.

>> No, I mean that there was sort of one of my questions. I think that I was questioning the same thing. How do we evaluate -- what does that mean? The quality I think that is difficult but Sherry and I were working on using the guidelines on what is supposed to be best practice for kids who were serving deaf and hard of hearing kids. Are these -- is everything present? Are these services present which we know that they're not? And

then if they are how are we collecting data aren't that to ensure that kids are -- that either the stakeholders are satisfied and their needs are getting met. Whether that is around things like expanded car curriculum. Are we collecting data around those specific needs that are very specific to deaf and hard of hearing kid? I don't know if that makes sense. I don't know if you have anything to add, Sharon?

>> Well, when you say collect the data, who would collect that data? Is it the service provider? That to me would be a measure of quality and a measure of impact. Part of this role of the committee is the document, but I think we're also hoping about the symmetric. Who would collect those data, Jen?

>> Well, I think it would depend on what the data is. I think a lot of it -- I think that if we are providing direct instruction and I say we meaning the service provider. Any service provider I think it would be up to us as a service provider. And typically hopefully those goals would be on an IEP. Like Sherry said we would be reporting on those hopefully, the growth, growth within those goals.

>> Okay. But the data are just reported to the IEP team. They're not rolled up to the state level.

>> Right. Yeah. I would agree with Sherry that there is really no data except while there is one -- I believe that the care team is also responsible. We received from the AOE document that really -- I have to look at it again, but Tracy, you can remind me. I remember it asked body a lot about an amount of time that a student was spending in a regular education classroom. I don't even remember a lot. That's the biggest that sticks out.

Tracy, can you remember? It was sort of like Sherry said, it was high level. 20 percent, you know, whatever. 21 to 42.

>> And it was just for IEP.

>> Exactly. It was just for kids on an IEP. That was the only data that we had to share at the state level.

>> Okay. So would it be fair to say that this subcommittee cannot have a goal of looking at educational attainment or student progress as one of its metrics?

>> We would not have access to that data.

>> Okay. Yeah, yeah, I would agree.

>> This is Sherry. And the assumption of more or less time in the classroom as an indicator of effectiveness is very political. So I think we have to work hard and I think Sherry is great. What are the caters in a state of providing a wholistic program -- maybe it's wholistic at this point and is it a number of professionals, what are some things that are accessible because getting it from schools, from parents, from AOE, is prohibited. That's the challenge.

>> Okay. Okay.

>> Is that accurate, Jen, from your perspective.

>> Yes. This is Jen. And I would say yes. And sort of tagging along from Tracy, I think that that is a little tiny bit what I've been struggling with as I think about this process. Just because it is -- as I think about it if we're looking at each agency or service provider or agency that's providing services. It's so clear that they do -- both of the agencies right now the two main agencies do have sort of different -- I don't know, niche areas. And so if you're evaluating one then they're clearly not going to have -- that the services are not providing and the same with the other agency. So does it make sense that we're looking -- so I'm still thing are we looking if does Vermont have these services or looking at the agency that's providing them?

>> So I think our chart based on the legislator is if Vermont is providing -- so ultimately the goal would be to evaluate everyone and I think we won't get there all in one year.

>> I was going to say -- this is Sherry -- and to establish some benchmarks so that in the future funding these are the pieces that someone would have to prove. So I think that's part of the issue. So if you are accessing resources that here are the things you have to prove you're doing it would indicate that you're providing a quality program. So I think about the grants that I write there are some matrix that I have to comply with

including, you know, correlating meetings to talk about the goals and objectives and reporting out and those kinds of pieces that, you know, we may not be able to assess every program but we can talk about the qualifiers that we feel are important to be existing to providing quality programs to our students who are DeafBlind and hard of hearing. Does that make sense? It's kind of rather than that us testing them, here's what we're going to be looking for. This is what is important to us. And so if a grant is written for funding of programs it would need to be included in that grant and then they would have to prove they are doing that.

So we're not going to be asking people to submit documents or whatever or testing or surveying. Instead, here's our expectation. If you're providing services in the state this is what we value and you indicate to us that you're offering a quality program. Show us. Prove to us that you're doing that. So maybe that's a different orientation.

>> Yes. I agree Sherry because the guarantee has to prove that the organization is doing what they said it's going to do. And that's where Jen and I were talking earlier this week that the guidelines are a bit tricky because the way they're written it is for the entire team to evaluate. And what our charge is to evaluate the deaf hard of hearing services. We're not evaluating the school district. Of course in order for it to be successful that end of it has to work as well. But we're really in charge to evaluate the service and the service provider.

>> This is Sherry. I'm just trying to think of what are some of the existing models that we could parallel. So for schools we have what's called education of quality standards. And those EQSs we have to grade them and really outline. And then they have what they call integrate peer reviews and we have to meet those standards. And they have the, you know, everything from staffing and curriculum. We're in the process of rewriting it to make sure it has equity. So I'm wondering if that's a model in terms of education quality standards. We have quality standards for DeafBlind hard of hearing education and then they have to provide artifacts that demonstrate they are meeting these quality standards around providing services to this population.

>> I think that's what the nasty guidelines do, Sherry, but they're written in such a way that you have to appeal away the school district. I don't know, Jen, what do you think?

>> No, I agree. I think you're totally right, Sherry. That is exactly what the guidelines do. It says these are the principles. So Sherry and I were using that chapter nine which is the service review checklist. So it goes through each of the ten principles and then it breaks them down to minute steps of things that you have to look at. And so that's where we were noticing that some of these questions that they're asking don't -- the deaf hard of hearing or DeafBlind service provider don't have a lot of input if some of these things are happening or not. So I think that's where we were struggling to figure out to make sure that it was worded in a way that in a minimum, in my opinion, it served the deaf hard of hearing and DeafBlind provider should lead or guide the team in the discussion that's needed. As you discuss around -- as you discuss communication opportunities.

One of the big was is communication and opportunities with peers that use the same modality or language. So some of that is not really -- I mean, if it were there once a month or once a week -- it's difficult for us to ensure that's happening. So it's obviously going to be on the school district. And I think that that's where -- I mean it's impossible to tease out. But I think the provider should have the knowledge and be sure that the teams are even aware.

>> So Sherry. The benchmarks I think should have it but collectively we should decide which ones are more responsible for the service provider and leave out the ones that are more attributable to the school district.

>> And this is something that we could do. Maybe that's what the work is going through that chapter nine and determining what is problematic and problematic live service providers. And I think most schools would appreciate -- I know I would -- what there was a great resource I remember getting in terms of what school should be provide and I would pull that up. So what is quality standards provided services and I think that would be a really useful tool because it is so rare that you have a student that

meets in this definition. To be perfectly honest, if you may be in part of litigation in the future, you can say look I've reviewed the quality standards and we've met all those quality standards. So if you're going into litigation you want to say based on what was given to me, we did that.

So it's a useful tool in many ways.

>> Right. This is Sharon. So I think that's a great idea. And Jen and I will continue to work through chapter nine. But I would really love for other people to jump in there and look at chapter nine. And Tracy if you get back with all together, New Hampshire theoretically had that grant and then went through the implementation step. So that might be helpful too.

And then, Amelia, are you there? She just joined us.

>> I am.

>> Hi, Amelia. Welcome. And so Amelia also contacted the Minnesota Collaboration ration. So we're going through reporting on what resources you found and do you have the magic bullet to make our work easier.

>> I wish. I wish. I didn't hear back from Minnesota at all. I read that document that you gave me that talks about those goals and the resources that they used. And I couldn't find anywhere like how are they assessing in gathering information. They did talk about how they had a parent survey. But, again, I didn't have the specifics on how they assessed and what did they measure.

>> Okay. So the paper that I sent Amelia was the 2014 paper where they had a big consortium in the meeting. So thank you for trying and keep on it, okay.

>> No, I'm going to keep on working on it and see if I can get some more information on it. Any guidelines and special ed guidelines. So I was able to find a one sheeter talking about their proposed goals but nothing else on that.

>> Mm-hmm. And any luck connecting with Tracy Evans from New England deafblindness.

>> Yes, she shared the data that they collect. I put it in the folder, the shared folder that you had sent out. So the child count data and talk about quality and services or anything like that. She's more than willing to chat with anybody, join a meeting, and, you know, answer any questions or anything like that.

>> Okay. Thank you. And were you going to reach out to Stephanie Bessonette?

>> I did not guilty reach out to her because she's not in charge of VABVI. And Tracy runs all of the DeafBlind. So she collaborates really really closely or whoever. She pulls the two different together.

>> Okay. It sounds like you've gotten to where we need you to be. Jen.

>> Yes. I can just jump in. I did also reach out to somebody in Minnesota. Her name was Mary Cashman Backem. And she said they used chapter nine and had some sort of a meeting and special educators. I think they did some work with the special ed directors and then they went back with their individual educational team and really went back through their chapter nine and what services were and were not provided.

And I also emailed a gentleman, Rick -- I'm sorry I'm terrible with names. Rick Huan who was from Washington state. Did you already share this?

>> No, I had it here that you and I have a meeting pending with him.

>> Perfect. That's what I was going to say. He actually did say that he put together some type of rubrics that he has used in the past. And he was going to send some samples. He hasn't done that yet. Maybe he has a magic bullet. He was very gracious and might as well take advantage.

>> So when he does send those resources, Jen, just forward it to us and put it on the Google Drive that would be great.

>> Okay.

>> So can you see the Excel document? This is what I have done. National Deaf Center. I reached out to Michelle and trying to see what she can find out there. I contacted Karen Hopkins as well. And she sent me to Minnesota and I passed that onto Amelia. Sarah Honigfeld from NAD, I emailed her and I'm waiting her response.

And the same with Allison Sedey from ODDACCE. And when I spoke to her, they were getting ready to host Dr. Johnson here in Vermont, I'm not sure if it was 2020 or 2021, but it got canceled because of COVID. And they were going to hold off and as Michelle explained it to me their charge for their time and our subcommittee doesn't have any money. But Vermont Hands and Voices may have some funds. So I think that's an ongoing conversation. But it does seem like that might be a viable option particularly if New Hampshire has had some success.

>> Yes, this is Jen. Hands and Voices worked alongside with -- Michelle was really part of the guidelines and the Hands of Voices and Margaret was also on that. Brittany, there was a group of them working with Sheryl to try and figure out how they were going to use her and/or Armando.

>> Okay. Right. So it sounds like we have an action plan that we should really begin to drill down on chapter nine and try to make them the quality standards. Are there other resources that we should follow up on other than my list from the National Deaf Center? Lauren is away on vacation and she's chasing these down.

But is there anything else that we could potentially be missing?

>> No, this is Sherry. I think that, again, homework for next time is that we all read chapter nine and to see if it is translatable into quality standards. And NASDSE is the go-to document.

>> So this is -- Tracy, go ahead.

>> Yes, this is Tracy. You know, it's interesting because I think I have read the guidelines and I think some of it is applicable and is some of it crosses over to the questions in the statute and those might be the ones we want to pull out. And that might be a question for the tram. Are you collecting data? What is the data you're collecting? And some I thought were vague like every child is unique. Well, how do we measure that and make it a standard? We would hope by default everyone is treating children based on their program.

So I think it's a great resource but I think we still have to extrapolate what applies. I think we're going to have to take pieces of it that applies to the statutes and questions.

>> This is Sherry. I think what I've seen in the past are indicator and uniqueness. So there are a variety of programs offered and do you have more than one. So I think if that's the statement if the program is unique then we would list -- how would we define uniqueness and what would be indicators of that. Are you providing documentation which could include the indicators that you could show that are collecting data?

That was one of the things that we have to do with IEPs that we don't have cookie-cutter programs. And can you demonstrate that depending on the severity of the DeafBlind and deaf hard of hearing, you would have to provide resources that would indicate that you can respond to a variety of needs for a student that, you know, would qualify as a step of deaf and hard of hearing. That would be the fun part. What would we as outside people would be looking for that would indicate uniqueness and data collection? Are you looking at regular progress? I think we could break that out in a way -- we're not going in there with the microscope. They have to provide artifacts that shows that that's happening and that changes the whole dynamic. That makes me excited.

>> So Amelia.

>> Yes, I joined on late. But it seems we're focusing on the nasty guidelines. Since NASDSE is only for deaf and hard of hearing are we applying it to the DeafBlind program as well?

>> Yes, this is Jen. I think that that we might want to pull in and that we could -- I think this would be a good resource. As we look at those, I think most of those had principles and are very applicable to kids who are DeafBlind as well. So I think just making sure what we're looking for and make sure that we capture what we need and what we want. What does that mean for kids who are DeafBlind. That's what I would say.

I don't know if there is another -- I don't know of another guidelines like this for DeafBlind kids to be honest.

>> No, we don't have one. They have NASDSE for vision impairment, but don't have one for DeafBlind.

>> Very well. That's your next life.

>> So I just wanted to take this issue -- Jacqui, are you there.

>> I -- Hi, I am here.

>> Great. Well, welcome. So Jacqui you're looking at the shared space, the Google Doc I created. Did you get the e-mail from me?

>> I believe so. I haven't accessed it yet.

>> So I would just ask if there's anything to update would you put it here. You have sent the group a list of this and the PowerPoint. I think our discussion just before you logged on was whether or not any of this data was very useful or are they more macro level. So it doesn't help us get down I think the level that this committee is charged to get to.

So if you can think of any other data that you have available within your agency that might be helpful, we would love to hear about it.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> You can think about it and let us know by e-mail.

>> Sure. I didn't know there was any further discussion. I know in my e-mail I have reached out as I said to our smarter bounds assessment folks. And even the assessment that the students take and I put in the requests to help folks look. And I know Nape, that request was going to take another ten days. So I haven't given up on the achievement data but it's been proven to be more complicated and what I can actually share with the team, but it's not because of a lack of transparency. So it can be helpful to you.

>> Okay. Well, thank you. We'll looking forward to hearing that. So this is the shared space. So the NASDSE guidelines -- so our homework, Jacqui, for next one is for everyone to go in and read these guidelines. Chapter nine is the more detailed checklist of how privy they should assess themselves. And we're going to have to work

together as a group to set our quality metrics because some of them clearly rests the responsibility with the school system and some with the provider. So we're going to work over the next three or four weeks before we meet again. And this Word document anyone can go in there and edit it. Each of the ten principles are separate in a different row. So anyone can jump in there and make comments. So is that clear for everybody?

>> So this is Sherry. What we were thinking about is what if in taking the direction of AOE in terms of educational quality standards. And it comes to mind but is there an opportunity to use that to develop quality standards for programming for deaf DeafBlind hard of hearing. And they would have to provide documentation artifacts that they are meeting these quality standards. And what Sharon and Jen were sharing is that there's also a school piece. I would appreciate having some quality standards for deaf DeafBlind and hard of hearing. I know way back when we had the school age meeting, we talked about these directors. And I think it would be for school districts even if they didn't have to provide artifacts. These are the pieces that you should play. But if we did quality standards for programming then you would ask anyone who is receiving funds that here are our quality standards. We talked about them -- one of them was the unique programming. And so we would under unique programming provide indicators. Do you offer a variety of interventions, modalities, do you depend on the severity of the disability? So what would be in an artifact that would indicate that, rather than having an assessment tool have quality standards that programs then would have to either annually or quarterly demonstrate or provide artifacts if it is data collection. That you are using multiple indicators of progress. I think this team can really come up with some good indicators based on what they're saying it's the quality programs.

I know as a director that would be really helpful. So that's what we did in an hour. We're a really productive group.

>> And this is Sharon. I think that in our review of resources we also agreed that there are few things that we could follow up on and we'll report back to the group via e-mail

and/or add to the documents. So ribbing and Sheryl Johnson once I connect with Jen too and Tracy thank you for following up all together. I will sort through the list of resources.

And the last one it's really more in the realm of Lauren's. And those things are beyond our subcommittee. So I think one of the things in addition to agreeing to jump into chapter nine we need to think about who else we need to engage with. Someone just mentioned inviting Tracy Evans to make sure that the quality standards that we come up to include the DeafBlind population. But there are other people that we should invite to our future meetings.

>> Well, I think that it would be good for us to have a deaf person attend if possible. I think if we -- John Ferrone has been becoming more involved and sort of in deaf education. He's also extremely busy. So I don't know if he is available but he is somebody that we could reach out to. There are also other folks at UVM who they are ASL instructors. We could talk to them or we could also have deaf staff members from our agency or from Vermont cares team as well. I mean, I know that the letter came out this morning or last night. And I don't know if that, you know, it sounds like we're moving on. If we are still sort of put the invites out there, I don't really know.

>> Mm-hmm. Yes, I think the invites -- I mean we'll talk about this at the end of the meeting. We'll talk about that at the end of the meeting. The other person I was wondering about is Michelle John and her role. When I think about the stakeholders is obviously the professionals but it's also the administrators. It's also Amelia and me and Sherry. But the Vermont Hands and Voices is the sort of more formalized parent group. I think it would be important to hear from them.

Thoughts about that?

>> This is Tracy. I don't know if this is a good idea but I wonder if there's a student that might want to join our committee. A high school student or a couple of students that might talk to us about their experience and to help us where they see the gaps are so we could include that in our recommendations.

>> And, Tracy, how would we identify that student with all the guidelines.

>> Yes, well, I think we could just ask the director.

>> This is Sherry, my experience has been in order to get students into it you have to have a role with them. Especially adolescents which is my forte you have to make a direct contact and you have to have a relationship and once that's existing, you know, you start the parents that you'd like to invite. The blanket ones they are too busy.

>> Yes. Maybe it's someone who is an adult that recently graduated that could share some insight.

>> Yes, I had a student who is a very very busy graduate student and I could approach her and see if she's available. But this definitely would be important.

>> And this is Sherry. It's great to have them to have great opportunities to be part of a group. I have a student advisory council and it's such a great opportunity as opposed to be receiving all the change. I think sometimes just having that opportunity to make change is so critical for a kid.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> And I think that we could likely come up with a student or two. I'm thinking about a couple that are coming to my end. So I think we can certainly work on that.

>> Okay.

>> Something else that happened on mind that I'm not sure if we were to have a special educator.

>> Yeah, I think someone from the school side would be important. And, again, I don't know how you identify those people or who they are. So we have to rely on you folks that are in the field to identify them and then invite them.

Are there other administrators, Jacqui, or Sherry that we could think of?

>> It all depends on capacity and time as everybody knows, you know, how we typically recruit for feedback and individuals we've got the weekly field memo. That we can list a blurb, this is who we're looking for, this is who we contact. We have a month communication that go out to nuggets. That's another area and then there's also -- I

meet with directors biweekly on Mondays at 3:00. So that's two different ways to get access to folks.

>> Okay. So we have the suggestion of someone who is deaf. Michelle John, a taint in high school. I could reach out to the college student. Who wants to reach out to John Perrone?

>> Jen.

>> Okay.

>> I'm sorry. This is Jen. Can you give me some idea? Are you anticipating that they'll be joining and meeting with us for the rest of the time?

>> Well, I think to have their input in perspective in how if the experience he woof. And you can just bring it bug and he can meet at one of our times then he could also come and provide that feedback directly. We come up with a list of questions that we would want him to address.

>> He's an adult. She's not a student thew went through the program here.

>> Oh, I misunderstood.

>> Okay. I'm sorry if I didn't say that correctly. Yes, I'm trying to think about what would be the best way to -- I guess I just want to make sure that we're thinking of having somebody with us.

>> Yes, we're doing some perspective taking and having different stakeholders. I think it would be very different depending on which stakeholder comes to the table. How can we mind a case manager?

>> Go ahead.

>> I was going to check the three tools that you had and how I heard by the deaf and hard of hearing. And the things that goes in different places. It's valuable for them as well. They work at the macro level and having an import. These are quality standards. And help them decide when they're looking for someone who comes in how do I know if this is a good provider or not.

>> So thank you for taking that on, Jacqui, and listening approximate -- putting out that solicitation.

>> Is someone willing to write two to three sentences about the aim and point of contact and I can make it all formatted for the different venues. So if someone wants to -- especially because I miss the context.

>> I can do that for you, Jacqui.

>> Thank you.

>> So if you're thinking about you want us to check then please reach out. So everyone has access to the shared space? Any problem accessing it?

>> Yes.

>> So everyone has received the Zoom links for our next two meetings that are scheduled. Anyone not received them?

Okay. Hearing no one that's great. And so our next meeting. So Jen, Jacqui and, Laura I need to conduct our Doodle poll. So Sherry is definitely available and of course I'm making myself available and Amelia and Tracy thank you for filling it out. And Laura is away on vacation this week. So if you could do that that would be great. Thank you, Jen.

>> Thank you. I apologize. I thought I did it. But I will do it right after that.

>> Right. Are you okay, Jacqui, with it?

>> Mm-hmm.

>> Okay. Awesome. I will forward you the responses. So we'll let Sherry take a few minutes.

>> So does people feel we have a balance approach? I wonder if we need to have e -- Jacqui raised the letter question. Maybe we need to have that conversation maybe after this.

>> There question go. SNE yes, yes. So you all received a letter from Margaret this morning. And I guess there are a couple of things to share. Sherry and I met with Spencer; when he sent out the invitations to nominated members to the Subcommittee,

the statute and the language about assessing was included. So our work will move forward and we hope that the UVM cares will join us in that work.

In terms of the issue of conflict of interest, when anyone of we can send a disclosure and I can send it to all of us again and so that we all behave correctly. And it's hard to find people to have the obligations they need. So that the comments about the scope of work, the conflict on interest. I think we're clear on that. I think we are legislatively able to do this. And I'll hold on my questions until you all have had a chance to comment? Or questions?

>> I'm sorry. I think there's no questions and I think we turned this responsibility over to Spencer since he is chair of council. And based on his conversation today when I think about quality standards, I think we're really trying to provide a structure that any organization they can use. Again, we're taking from our national document. So I feel good that Spencer is going to address that and I feel good we are moving forward in our work. Any other thoughts?

>> Tracy.

>> I just want to agree. I think that was a really helpful response and I think it makes a lot of sense. I know I'm not supposed to repeat but I want to concur.

>> That's okay. Amelia.

>> Well, I'm excited that this work can go forward. And I feel really badly that Margaret thinks it was a biased opinions towards this and we sat to have conversations and people kept talking about this person and that person. So I was trying to bring that back and so, you know, I feel badly that Margaret feels that she was slammed in the article. It wasn't at all. It was trying to bring the conversation back on track in our hours and hours of meetings. So I'm excited that we can continue to go forward. It is what it is; right.

>> Well, we're so happy that you're still engaged and we look forward to your input.

>> Thank you. I think as a parent trying to advocate for my child and other children it is disheartening. I can see why parents back off. And it's really sad that that happens in

the state and I've heard that this has been happening for years and years. I wish more parents would participate and share their experiences. We are living it firsthand and I hear my daughter I want to meet a deaf kid. And I think the parent's voice is so important and to have something like this I can see why parents give up.

>> Well, we hope you don't give up. Jacqui, comments?

>> No, I think this is going to be an important conversation over, you know, the upcoming months. You being able to prepare some quality standards for guidelines for educating individuals in this way. But we'll also have to talk about I know you mentioned EQS and I gave you the links to our monitoring system our LEAs and expectation where we go and clack quantitative data, you know, on our website is our actually checklist and we want to make sure if they can flow together. And they'll do guidelines as much as what we're hearing and other states do.

I'll also have to be wearing the LEA hat as far as what our examinations are so I've been through this experience with the same mission of assessing program's performance. So I'm looking forward to this conversation that I'm also going to have to ask questions given my role to be supporting for children and youth in our state. So thank you for having patience and wearing with me on that and not compete.

>> Mm-hmm. And any comments on Margaret's letter.

>> This has been a day when I need to open my e-mail. And I want to be able to thoughtfully respond and I have not been in a position to do so.

>> Okay. Thank you. And Jen.

>> No, I appreciate all of your feedback. I agree with all of you. I think it's of frustrating and I think I was disappointing because approximate I feel like we have made an effort to make sure we're and I really enjoy you who -- I mean, she's amazing, but I think I was a little disappointed. And so, you know, I question if they really understand what we're doing. I think that I think my initial response had they seen, did they watch back the first meeting. So oat -- I would like them to be involved in this so I do hope there are other discussions around the letter and help them understand what our mission is and the

providers who are receiving from the state. So me I think we just want to look at what are we doing and using these nasty guidelines. I just hope that -- I was disappointed and I hope we can get the people that we need around the table. They should be part of this discussion.

>> Yes, I agree with that. And we've invited all these people that we can work together. We're trying to get everything running back up again and everyone was coming together to work together again. I don't know. It was not a nice letter -- I mean not like -- just left a bad feeling with that letter.

>> Okay. Well, we'll certainly leave the door open for them to come back to the table. But, again, we have to move forward and so that will continue. And we will meet again Monday, April 4th, so between now and then jump into chapter nine and please at your comments that Jen and I started and take those Ch 9 principles. And if you need to shoot me an e-mail when you follow up in your contacts once you find something that would be great.

Any other closing comments?

>> When we talk about backtracking, did we want Tracy to join or just to come talk about the DeafBlind?

>> Well, if you could follow up on that -- I think what we would like her expertise on is to make sure that we adapt these principles and also add to them whatever we suggest to add to them.

>> Okay.

>> Jen said that they could extend but we need an expert.

>> Okay.

>> So it might be more efficient if you don't mind, Amelia, if you send her the chapter nine and is it just more efficient for her to communicate with you directly.

>> Okay.

>> Or is it more efficient for her to come on our committee meeting.

>> Okay. Perfect. Thank you. I just needed clarification.

>> Thank you. And I'll send an e-mail. All right. Sherry, you want to wrap up.

>> Yes, I was just going to say thank you. I mean, in lieu of that letter I just want to say how productive and I'm excited about this work. And in terms of if anyone has any questions or concerns you can send them via e-mail.

>> Good.

>> All right.

>> Thank you, everyone.

>> Thank you so much.

>> Have a good evening.

>> Bye.

>> See you soon.