

Deaf Education Task Force Meeting

Appoquinimink Training Center

118 South Sixth Street

Odessa, Delaware

May 29, 2015

1:00 p.m.

Captioner: Shavon Kolb, RPR

Karasch & Associates

"This text is being provided in a 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."

MR. CAMPANO: I think we're going to get started. There's several handouts within each packet that I give you. What will be on top is the agenda and then the reports or recommendation from the subcommittees. What we want to get done today is all the work that's happened so far with subcommittees and within the larger group.

So today what we want to do is go over all the recommendations of the work that's been done this far. We were hoping to be done with recommendations and

drafts of recommendations and head off to the legislation to figure if they want to support this or not and how. In talking with Quinn recently he said too they're having something done today. That's off of them to figure out meaning legislature and the state of how to make recommendations or if we didn't have to have anything done to the define detail. I've asked each subcommittee to put together recommendations as if it it's in the report to send off from Quinn processing. What I want to do today is go over, I'll read the agenda quick and we'll add any others to the end. Definition of subcommittee and that's answering questions three and four. About number four definitions for deaf hard hearing and deaf blind. We want to talk about the screening subcommittee, screening procedures reevaluated to reflect best practices, the question about having a centralized database that was question three and that also addressed underneath number six D, B and N. Coordinate with C E W and L E As. That's a brief description of what some of this would address. Number four is staffing with the subcommittee and staffing and talking about -- there's another letter after three. On number four staffing there's a subcommittee that worked on that and looks at some

issues Arnold staffing, how it would be staffed, question of people moving underneath the state and such and case load count.

Number five is really the big one and that's in looking at the majority of the recommendations this task force wants to address to come up with suggestions or recommendations for around the structural and funding components for a state wide entity. Remembering that the question at hand was what came out of the first task force was the need for a separate entity out from underneath the district better funding sources, better job descriptions, updated code throughout to make sure it matched the current time because the code we were facing or looking at or using was actually 30 years old. The last part, we'll leave the last 30 minutes of the meeting for public comment. So I want to get through the recommendations from all the subcommittees first. We'll process that. If anybody from the public has questions, please wait them down. We want to be sure we get through this today being the last meeting. Maybe even more than 30 minutes at the end to review. Any other questions, thoughts or concerns we should add to the agenda or are we okay with looking at the first subcommittee and moving on? Say we move on.

The first recommendation or first subcommittee we'll look at the recommendations was on the definitions of deaf hard of hearing and deaf blind and how we can change code or if code needs to be changed. What code would need to be changed if any, and to what. Kathy was heading up the subcommittee. Let's take a few minutes and read it. If you have any questions.

MS. RILEY: I don't want to read it out loud to people. Everybody can read.

MR. CAMPANO: Folks ready to start discussing this in does anybody else need more time? What I'd like to do is ask Kathy head of the subcommittee so if you'd have Kathy kind of talk a little bit not read the whole thing but talk about what are the changes in general anden any questions anybody has.

MS. RILEY: So the recommendations really we looked at a lot of other states and looked at the holes in right now who served and not served. There are a number of kids out there with hearing loss who are not necessarily getting support. So based on that the recommendations we made is that a kid with a hearing impairment now just because you have a hearing impairment doesn't necessarily mean you have an U IEP. That's a team decision, with you a child is qualified

as having a hearing impairment if they have a permanent I know this is all medical stuff, but conductive sensory non sensor or mixed hearing loss. That's 20 D B or greater. So that's minimal hearing loss of greater at two or more frequent sees, either one ear or two ears or the kid can have -- we do have children out there for medical or facial reasons have fluctuating hearing loss and again they have to exhibit that same level of hearing loss unilaterally or bilaterally, but you also have to be able to see that it's adversely impacting their education. Because for some kids it's not. And then that means everybody six months we need a hearing test because those kids can hear really well at times and hear not well at others.

The third category which is never addressed previously because we didn't know about it four years ago when the last codes were written is auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder and so again we put the medical description of that in there and made a strong note to say that behavioral audiogram is not a good way to measure auditory function with a kid who has neuropathy and therefore any child that meets the medical criteria for neuropathy does also qualify as hearing impaired. Any questions on that?

MR. CAMPANO: Before we go on, I want to say too there's two definitions that we're looking at. Hearing hard of hear and then deaf blind. One plays into the other one. Before we go onto the deaf-blind part, does anyone have any thoughts, concerns, comments around the deaf hard of hearing part so far.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: You had mentioned before that this wasn't necessary for qualification for services.

MS. RILEY: Right.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Do we need to note that in here. If a parent read this, they may automatically believe if A, B or C occurs they automatically are eligible for special education services? Is that something that we address here.

MS. RILEY: I was hoping that Sarah could help us and my understanding from Quinn that's the stuff that would be fine tuned at department of Ed. We don't have to have that exactly out yet. But we may have to write something in there like in some of the beginning stuff where I wrote about not me, we, about the D O J, DOE new statement that says that kids who are in regular Ed have ADA had 11 requirements that we're also obliged to me. So that, those categories list you as a child with hearing impairment doesn't necessarily determine that you have an IEP.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Perhaps we could put a note for use at the next level to consider that, put that in the back of their mind that they need to reference the difference between eligibility for services and the definitions.

MS. RILEY: Objection. Did you make that note?

MR. CAMPANO: Tracy also pointed out that the cart will have that in the minutes.

I'll add it to the subcommittee summaries and I'll make a little asterisk at the bottom that was one of the recommendations something around qualifications for IEP versus classification for deafness.

MS. RILEY: The next piece we did was to talk about when we did the E S R the eligibility every three years that we have a current audit logical and that listed out and again a lot of this comes from a what a lot of other states do, list out what's appropriate for diagnosis of a hearing loss because some of us have seen some funky stuff come from people that probably shouldn't be accepted but often districts don't know what should and shouldn't be accepted.

And then we aligned our definitions of the severity of hearing loss with what is proposed nationally by the American Speech and Hearing

Association which interestingly is not what our local children's hospital uses, but I think they may change that now. We did write a piece about central auditory processing. We did a lot of investigation into that. That is very clearly under ID E A considered a learning disability and we wrote the definitions in there. Now, one of the problems that we're having in the state right now is that some districts hire an audiologist to support the kids. Some people hire a teacher of the deaf. Central auditory processing is under the scope of practice for an audiologist. What's unfair to parents is that if they happen to be in that district and that person happens to have it on their case load, they go ahead and serve that kid when the parent this happened recently the parent moves to another district where the support person is the teacher of the deaf and suddenly they lose services and they don't understand why and they think it's unfair and I don't necessarily disagree with them. So what we're proposing is again hopefully if people get some kind of a consolidated system, educational audiologists can serve on the child's team if they're an auditory processing care, but they are not under the classification of hearing impairment.

We have to find out a coordinated system or not.

If it stays as if, we're going to be in the same boat because different people have different service providers.

Then when went into deaf blindness and I really just took what is used from the vision and visually impaired about what constitutes a vision loss. So theoretically you would think that vision loss plus hearing loss makes deaf blind, however we wrote a calf yacht at the bottom really talking about the fact that it's not deaf plus blindness. It's more like deaf times blind. So our suggestion is that the writes be a little bit different for kids who already have a hearing loss but then their vision loss would not have to be as extreme before they become deaf blind and again in vision impairment it says that you have to have 20/70 and I think we left that and then the other thing it says is that your visual field has to be down to 20 degrees which is very limited. And so we would suggest if you already don't hear well that by the time your vision gets to 40 degrees, you should be considered deaf blind as well as we added in some other neurological vision impairments that although again in common practice some people are serving those kids, but it's not currently written in the regulars that those kids qualify so just in terms of keeping

them safe under the law we want to make sure those things are recognized.

We did add a piece about and again a lot of this we looked at other states and what they have written. So looking at kids who we can get a good vision test on because of their age, maybe they're an infant or additional disabilities and so a functional addition evaluation would serve more kids where we're not able to get a medical evaluation. And that court ankle vision impairment so medical impairment does also qualify for deaf blindness. Obviously you have to have a hearing loss.

So that's pretty much the summary of that.

MS. THOMAS: Do you want to ask Sarah now that she's here?

MR. CAMPANO: With you repeat her question.

MS. RILEY: Do you want to repeat your question.

MR. CAMPANO: No. Andi's question.

MS. THOMAS: My question was do you want to repeat the question because Sarah's here. That was it.

MS. RILEY: Let me fill you in a little bit. We were talking about the fact that lieutenant definition of hearing impairment because of the new DOE D O J statement that came out in the fall from the federal

government talking about children's rights to access to services and devices based on ADA and title 11 so when we do the hearing impairment the definitions of what qualifies as a hearing impairment so question from Josette was how do we put in there that that doesn't mean you necessarily qualify for an IEP because you might have been a 504 kid or you might be a kid in regular Ed who needs somebody with teachers at the beginning of year and that's it. Those kids have a right to those services now under that new ruling. We don't want everybody parent to think that just because their kid meets the definition of having a hearing impairment that they automatically qualify for an IEP. I don't know how to do that.

MS. CELESTIN: So I think that the recommendations that come from the task force are then -- we're then going to have to work with our attorney general's counsel to figure out what the regulations would say and the regulations would then -- if there's changes or revisions that are going to be made to the regulations that's when we would really kind of get more specific about what then qualifies for an IEP versus not. And so I think, you know, if you -- I'm sorry. I haven't read all of this yet, but if this is based on the research that you have adone in the other

states and the task force agrees and recommends then, it would really be up to DOE working with the attorney general's office to make a decision about how it should be written in the regulations so it's very clear where the line for an IEP be. 504 gets a little bit more blurry and that was more of a school decision in terms of a student that needs a 504 traditionally more for accommodations, not necessarily services. So I don't think -- I guess what I'm saying is I don't know if you need to make any division in here, but if this is what the task force recommends and puts forward, then we would be working with the attorney general's office to figure out in regulation how to make that clearer.

MS. RILEY: That's kind of what I guessed at. I said I was wishing you were here to answer the question and then you walked in. I said yeah, I was right and I guessed correctly.

MS. CELESTIN: I apologize for being late. We can start that conversation about how to draw that line, but there is a lot of confusion out there since the DOE/D O J document came out there's a question about where's the line for students with 504. People think of combinations but that talks about services so where is the line there. I would say for the majority

of students that are going to be qualifying with a hearing impairment or certainly with deaf blindness they're most likely going to be on an IEP. But we can could definitely try to make that clearer in regulation.

MS. RILEY: So that's where that would happen. That's good.

Were there any other questions or comments about what that says?

MR. CAMPANO: I'll just add a little comment in this report. It needs to be looked into further to separate that out, but other than that at this point this time -- go ahead, Sarah.

MS. CELESTIN: Kathy, when I walked in you were talking about how for students who were deaf blind that if they have a hearing loss that maybe the visual acuity loss, it shouldn't be as stringent if they have any kind of visual loss and they can qualify for deaf blind. I'm not an expert on this so I'm wondering about the opposite of that. If they're blind like should we have a different kind of level of hearing loss.

MS. RILEY: I think when you read the recommendations for what would classify you as having a hearing loss, that's pretty generous I would say in

terms of -- so I think that that will work -- so I think in the flip flop the way the recommended recommendations are made that would be a much easier thing to do, but I agree with you a hundred percent that for kids who have systems that are stressed or, you know, malfunctioning in some way you have to be -- you have to kind of take that into consideration that their only two distance senses are both impaired and that impacts tremendously how they access their education.

MS. THOMAS: Just for clarification because there was the change for the current meeting and IEP for an E S R for trien he will for 12 months to six months where did you come up with that?

MS. RILEY: Mostly from looking at other states.

So again that's only for the trienal. Now, in some states they say there has to be an annual evaluation, not E S R, but that it has to be on record that there's an annual hearing test. We didn't put that in because I think there's a lot of word if there for the school district for parents who don't always do what they're supposed to do. We've talked about this before. Sometimes districts have called and brought a kid up to the school for the deaf for a hearing test and then charged because they needed for

qualification. That doesn't mean it becomes their audit logical care. It means to be used to get the kid services and verify hearing loss, but it doesn't become their ongoing audiologist? Do you know what I mean? And again that's something we may have to work through a little bit.

MS. THOMAS: When you're looking at an initial kid who's continuously failing a nurse's hearing screening, the parents aren't taking him to the audiologist and it's determined that there's enough of a loss that there needs to be continued medical follow-up like the child may qualify for hearing aids because I know from you that there is a line that you're not -- there's a line where you're not supposed to be taking money from audiologists.

MS. RILEY: Right.

MS. THOMAS: You know the better way of saying it than I do. So each for initials we can bring them up to you and then figure out how it works out.

MS. RILEY: We have done that for kids especially for kids that moved in from other country and have no health insurance or who have no health insurance, period. I think you're right. My calf yacht to the district always is as an audiologist I can verify they have a hearing loss, but you can as

the teacher of the deaf pick them up for services, but together how are we going to solve that they don't have any insurance for hearing aids or they don't have a doctor who's going to deal with the medical stuff. I mean, that's the beyond of scope really of the school and that becomes medical intervention. We did ask -- when we get to the screening we'll talk about some of our suggestions around what happens when kids fail screenings and nobody does anything about it.

MS. CELESTIN: If I'm understanding this page number 3 letter A correctly, I think we might need to ask some qualifying language. Am I correct you right, Kathy, you're saying in preparation for an evaluation summary report, you would be using a written audiological evaluation that's not more than six months old, right?

MS. RILEY: Right.

MS. CELESTIN: I agree with that. I think there was confusion for every time you're convening. It's just for eligibility.

MS. CELESTIN: And reevaluation.

MS. RILEY: Right.

MR. CAMPANO: Something that Sarah said earlier in the deaf blind part and that combination how it's very unique for each child there is something written

in there below that talks about how the feds have an ID A written as loss but also how it affects the communication. Currently or regulation talk about qualifications based on language and a lot of our students need communication development. So that's one of the qualification criteria I think is going to help when it goes from definitions into this a lot more clearly for kids who are deaf blind it is about communication prior to getting the language.

Any other questions or thoughts on the definition part? If we're good with that, I'd like to make a recommendation if someone makes a motion that we vote on it.

MS. RILEY: You can't make the motion.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I move that we vote on this.

MR. CAMPANO: There's been a motion to vote on this.

We were going to save public comment for the end? Can we do that?

There's been a motion to vote on this. All in favor (hands raise).

MR. CAMPANO: Seven voted for. None against.

The next subcommittee was on screening and that was the single page, just one side.

MS. RILEY: There is more to that and it's not

here.

MR. CAMPANO: Are we missing?

MS. RILEY: We're missing a whole page that has the actual recommendations on it.

Tracy, can I plug this in and then I can read them from there. I think that paper only has the background stuff so if people want to go ahead and read through that.

MR. CAMPANO: I apologize for the delay, guys. Instead of reading it to everybody we're going to get it printed off quick, bring it back to we can look at it. While we're waiting how about if we switch over to the data results or the subcommittee on the data. We talked about having the centralized data. That's Laurie. I'll take care of that one. It's pretty short. Everybody just take a minute, read the summary of the task force on data results. The first page and a half is really the summary of the recommendation. The last couple of pages is the survey that went out and the answers that came with it.

I think everybody's had a chance to read it now. We can have open comments and discussions around this.

MS. CELESTIN: So what was striking to me about reading through kind of the different things that people are asking for and looking at you have two

really different kinds of things here, things that can be pooled really easily from some of our state databases like the E school or IEP plus that's pretty basic compliance information in terms of initiation dates and transition dates and things like that and then you have other more qualitative information that would really take an analysis of the IEP and even potentially kind of a monitoring of the program the student's receiving. So some of these pieces in terms of identifying if the student is receiving appropriate supports and services, if the student is making progress on the IEP goals, if the student is really making I'm looking at these pieces around child outcome data and if they're making progress. This is much more qualitative information that would really have to be, you know, take staff power, manpower to look at IEPs, really make more qualitative judgments about kind of the qualitying of the programming servicing. That's different than the other items which can be pooled from a state wide database in terms of compliance to timelines and things like that. So I feel like I know this is all lumped into database, but I think there are some things where you can either build on to an existing state database or even if the state wide was going to create their own

database and pool their information from E school or IEP plus, I think that's really doable without a whole lot of staffing time. I think the other pieces that it looks like people are looking at, we would have to consider the amount of staff time it would take to really do kind of a monitoring of these different qualitative pieces. So I just wanted to point that out because it's not all pieces in a database. Some is looking at student's services and outcomes.

MR. CAMPANO: Anyone else? Andi?

MS. THOMAS: Just a little thing. On page 2 it actually sees there's communication plans are being completed. There's nothing that actually says that a communication plan must be completed, a conversation must be had. Chapter 474 we tend to call it a communication plan, but there is no physical document that has to be -- that's required. It's the dialogue, the discussion that's supposed to come.

MS. RILEY: And the documentation thereof.

MS. THOMAS: And the documentation thereof. An easy way to document is, yes, is a conversation, but documentation in the notes.

MS. CELESTIN: When DOE comes out to monitor IEPs, we look at page 2 the special factors where it says is the student deaf or hard of hearing and have

communication needs and if that's checked off as yes for any student that we're seeing that has a hearing impairment we would expect that would be indicated yes, but if it's not, that's a whole different conversation. For any student that's indicated yes we're looking through the IEP. I agree with what you're saying. It's not a document communication plan that's a separate thing, but that can be embedded into the IEP in a lot of different ways with the services modifications and then some place dozen have a specific type of communication plan they've crafted that links back to parts of the IEP. So we're looking at all of those pieces as a whole to make sure we're seeing that there are services and accommodations documented in the IEP that relate back to the student communication needs. If we saw there any evidence of services related to communication, that would really trigger us to go back to the districts and say what's going on here. I think we're on the same page in what we're looking for. I think what I've been seeing abdomen this is the same conversation happening in the task force related to students that are blind and visually impaired is the state does a monitoring sample every year so we don't hit every district and charter school every year and when we go to a district

we're doing a sampling over the students based on the demographics in that school. So if there are students with hearing impairments in the school, we definitely sample from that. If there aren't, by the sample if they have four students with hearing impairments in the school, we might only look at one of their files, not all of them. In the other task force there's been a lot of discussion is the role of state wide to be doing a more thorough monitoring beyond what DOE does where we're taking a small sample, but is there a role in state wide servicing. That's why I made the comment about staff time because some of these things that are on here are really simple and can be pooled to a database and other things you're discussing is more involved and takes more time to review the student file and sometimes interview and talk with staff. The question I'm posing what is the role of state wide. Are you really just looking to create a database that pools together information or are you looking for state wide to have more of a role in looking more in depth at files and providing technical assistance around that. I don't know what the answer is.

MR. CAMPANO: It would be the second of the two. So it would be to have the information not as

authoritative monitoring system but simply as to provide better support, what's there, what isn't there and what else can we help with and tracking numbers on that. There's also a need on birth through 21 how are things moving, how's progress happening, what's been tried, what hasn't. A lot of what the deaf blind database does from birth to 21 in collecting data. This isn't as mean students as it would be for deaf and heard of hearing. Man hours would definitely be an issue, but it was voted -- well, the survey shows there was a strong interest in it.

Any other thoughts or comments from the group?  
I have both mikes. That's great.

MS. RILEY: I agree. I think there's a role for state wide whether it's visually impaired or autism or whatever to be looking at what's happening so that we can provide technical assistance and part of the problem I think the first task force had is we can't figure out how many kids are out there because there's no database that's tracking them and as you kind of alluded to there are kids out there with hearing loss that don't have that necessarily marked on their IEP. There are tons of kids out there who don't have IEP and again we're going to go back to the new ruling around ADA and title 11 and what are we doing for

those kids. I think there should be a way that we're able to track those kids and only thing I worry about is the way that you sample the communication plan conversation is that part of that conversation is supposed to be about what are all the opportunities and placements available to a child and I've sat in meetings everywhere where that gets kind of glossed over and they're like oh, well, you don't need that because that's not your kid so we're going to talk about the placement he's already in. So I don't know. I have some -- but I do think we need to kind of reword that a little bit because that is what the law is. It doesn't say communication plan. But I do think I would agree with mark that I think there's some real value in providing meaningful technical assistance if you know what's happening out there. I mean, I think one of the frustrations we've had is lack of information.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Maybe it's just a two-second commercial. I don't want to speak for Sarah at all, but with the check to note that this kid has an area of need to me that's something separate than writing a whole plan tour someone or a district not doing something appropriately or not identifying that kid for services and I don't know if we need to come up

with a whole another plan just based on a district that may not be following what the expectations are for an IEP.

MR. CAMPANO: So at this point I think what the task force and committee was working on in regards to that again was not having some sort of authority with state wide practices. There's been a lot of concern around that but more of technical assistance that the deaf blind program has now. So the things we track and look at we would come up and say it starts with teacher and however it needs to be taken would then provide what the best practice is to make that change from state wide.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Got you.

MS. CELESTIN: I think that would be a traffic role to be more of technical assistance and talking with them about, okay, we're seeing that the student has a hearing impairment, but we really are not seeing any supports and services on the IEP. Maybe there's stuff you're providing that's not showing up on the IEP or maybe you're not providing stuff because you're not sure what to do. Let's talk about that versus what we're doing and monitoring saying there's nothing here, this is a red flag and now you have monitoring findings and district's involved. I think the beauty

of state wide what I'm trying to get to if we're voting to do something here with this database in its entirety including this kind of proper progress attic and services we have to realize that vote is saying there's going to be staff in order to review this more qualitatively and provide technical assistance. It's not just a vote for a database. It's a vote for saying we need staff that can provide this T A because I don't think we have that staff power now.

I forgot the other things. I know what the other thing. Kathy, your point are if students are being appropriately identified as having a hearing impairment in terms of their clarification, this has been a concern we have he seen trying to reconcile numbers for the other task forces that sometimes students are not -- some districts have not been putting in more than disability qualification. It may not be on their E S R but it's not making it into the E school database in terms of the clarification is. So I do think that could be presented as a concern that we're concerned that our numbers are not always correct because maybe some students are not being identified and that's not clear in the state system that these students have hearing impairments and so, you know, I think -- I know one thing that the other

task force was looking into is something that other states do in terms of when there's a sensory impairment whether it's, you know, deaf, hard of hearing, visual impairment, blindness, deaf blind that in some other states the facilitator for that task force was explaining that some states take a strong stand if theirs is sensory impairment that should be listed. The IEP team discussing, working with school psychologists, looking at the E S R and making decision what's the primary disability and so on. I think as a department we really need to look, dig deeper on that, but that's just a consideration. I know that the other task force was discussing whether they should make a statement about whether they believe the sensory impairment should be always listed as the primary disability and because I haven't really researched that I don't have a strong opinion, but I wanted to share that with you.

MS. THOMAS: What I found especially with my complex kids who are separate school setting all of my documentation was in for an E S R and I just assumed that, you know, that it was written on the trienal that it was secondary hearing impairment and what we're finding that we always serve the kids, but because for so long there was no secondary and a kid

with a lot of complex needs we haven't been primary. So I find that a lot of times where a kids have so many complex needs that the hearing impairment is an impacting factor, but it's not the most impacting factor.

MS. CELESTIN: That's why historically we've said that the IEP team makes that decision when you're discussing that about your school psychologist you're looking at also a student that has a severe. You're discussing all that and making the decision about what the IEP team feels is the bigger impact. Severe intellectual disability is first followed by the others. Maybe the statement is more about ensuring that all disability clarifications are inputted into the state system so that you can accurately see the number of hearing impairments versus making a judgment call. I agree with you that for some students that have multiple disabilities it really -- it may not make sense to say that the sensory disability has to be primary. I just wanted to -- that had been a discussion in one of the other task forces.

MS. RILEY: That also looking at IEPs, right?

MS. CELESTIN: I'm only speaking with kids with IEPs.

MS. RILEY: There are other kids out there who

just have 504 who just need a little bit of access for their education that are regular Ed. That's why the numbers game gets tricky because we don't currently have the database to track that and to be able to track what is the greatest need, is it equipment, is the greatest need teacher in servicing and that kind of technical support. We don't have any data right now around what is the greatest need for the majority of children. You're right when you say we're not just voting for a database. We recognize that that will entail a job for somebody because somebody has to be able to -- I know a lot of providers put stuff in as they go, but there will have to be somebody who's managing and overseeing that program.

MR. CAMPANO: This is kind of going off on the data, having a centralized database conversation, a very important one but to add to that, I think that what we find especially with the deaf blindness is a couple things. One is if there's assistive technology or equipment that levels the playing field and creates access to content and all the other learning needs. That's one issue. The other issue is even with that access there comes the loss or the lack of the incidental learning over the years up to this point and what's happening in that momentum. The deaf

blindness most of if not all with the exception -- we have 78 kids on the census right now. I think all but three have a classification on the deaf blind. If you don't have access to the best practices being provider, you're not making a difference. So I think the discussions that you're running into the other sensory fields is one that's sit extremely hard in deaf blindness as well as deafness we may just because a kid can hear something, has some vision and hearing it doesn't mean they have full access the same as their peers. Without that expertise and understanding those newances of how much they actually have to and the accommodations consistently provided and when the environment or something changes, who's there to assess are we providing the best practices for that child. So I don't know if you really want to discuss now adding some comment if there is a sensory impairment it gets listed somewhere in the primary, secondary or beyond or if it becomes primary or not. But that's just my two cents on that.

MS. RILEY: I think that's beyond the vote on the database. The other thing I was going to say is it's already 2:15 so we can admire this for a really long time or we can say we're going to take a leap of faith and say yes, this needs to happen or no.

MR. CAMPANO: I agree with Kathy. Unless the conversation is specifically about a database, let's ahead back to that. Is there any further discussion?

MS. CELESTIN: I would motion that we approve to move forward with the why of the database. I want to have something in the final recommendation that says that there's some consideration of existing state wide databases how these would be integrated. I hate for us to talk about creating something that a lot of this information already existed in a state wide database, but I agree with what Kathy said. There's a lot of pieces here that don't exist in a state wide database. I think we need to include something in the recommendation that talks about interfacing or at least drawing down information from existing databases.

MS. RILEY: Even within public health the database that looks at what kids have their hearing screening, who failed, who didn't, then schools can look and say oh, this was never addressed. I think there's a lot of existing databases out there that would be have to be piggy backed. I think there's way to do that I hope.

MS. CELESTIN: I would motion that we approve moving forward the database but with interfacing with

other state-related databases such as public health and DOE.

MR. CAMPANO: I've made a note to add the statement I put down for now is to be designed to work with existing state stance.

MS. THOMAS: My question is if we're saying yes to a database, are we saying yes to this document being presented? Because we've already discussed there's some things that need to be changed, some language changing. Are we saying yes to a data and this is what's going forth, then I would say no.

MR. CAMPANO: I think the two things at least that I heard that need to be changed regardless of how we're voting, one was the communication plans are being completed, changed to match with the existing code already says is that there needs to be documentation of a conversation around communication needs for one and two is something has to be added in in regards to having it designed to interface, work with other existing data systems. Was there anything else that needed to be amended or changed?

MS. MCCULLOUGH: And again I haven't had the opportunity to read this in its entirety, but a lot of this looks like with the database looking at the state wide service component what impact would this have at

the local level for individual districts? What would be the expectation?

MR. CAMPANO: Again this would be about so the technical assistance provided from that Critical Mass of expertise in the program would be able to come to the district here's what we've seen, here's the training to do it. So it would be more support based on what was identified.

MS. CELESTIN: If I have that correctly, what I think what's coming down to is are there things you're going to be asking for in the database that would potentially require more time of district or school staff of local school staff to either input that data or to pool that together and give to you? Would there be ramifications on staffing at a district or school in terms of the amount of time it's going to take them to get this information to you.

MR. CAMPANO: So the tricky part of this especially with the deaf blind program is there isn't mandated from the districts to do anything for us. So all the data we've collected is being given to the IEP, trienal, anything else we've participated, getting the information and we have to input it. I don't think this is written for at least in the conversations we've had this isn't about requiring for

from the districts to do. State wide program has to take on the owe news to do it. We have to get what's put in through the services provided. I don't think this would be supposed to be a come prehennive database that everybody says yes to this, we put it through, legislation passes it. I think as far as the deaf blind as services are being provided, as we go to IEPs and transition meetings and so far we've collected the data and input. More assessments we've done we've inputted. With the existing state systems we can have somebody pull that down and fill in something else. That would be my understanding at least based on the deaf-blind program does their database. We can either put something if you feel like it too, we can put a calf yacht in there. A third would be the day the fourth one could be this isn't a mandated thing on the district. We can put some kind of comment in there -- I'm not sure how to word it. It's not an additional burden on the districts. It would be up to the state wide programs to do it.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: That would make me feel a little bit better.

MR. CAMPANO: There's four changes to this.

MS. NEUGEBAUER: Before we send it in you guys

will have to approve it.

MR. CAMPANO: My question on that is do we have to reconvene for any of the in personal or can we do this electronically at all.

MS. NEUGEBAUER: We can do that electronically. Because we're making the decisions today, but it's just the writing of it.

MR. CAMPANO: In case you didn't hear what Tracy said, we're making the decision today to move ahead with it. Just the writing has to be done, everybody needs to see it and approve it. If the additions aren't there, then the committee can say no to it.

Any other comments, thoughts before we move on?

MS. RILEY: Are we going to vote on it? I would move that we vote.

MR. CAMPANO: So the first was it is written in here now in the proposal the communication plans are being completed as part of the data we collected. We want to change that to match more of what 474 says and that conversations about communication needs of a student are documented. So there's documentation that the conversation happened. That's what the regs states. We're going to change that to documentation of the conversation was added. Now, from that we talked about the further technical stance that the

state wide systems would provide is quality, best practice, implementation, ways to implement.

The second one was that this system should be designed or needs to be designed to work with or interface with existing state data systems. Talk directly to each other, work with the data that's out there.

The third was that this data system or this central eyed database is for technical assistance purposes only. It's not about monitoring. It's not about authority over. It's just simply to provide better services for the student from birth to 21 once they're identified to 21.

The fourth one was an additional comment to be made this is not to be an additional burden to the district. There's no responsibility of the district necessarily to fill this database out once it's established. The state wide programs will gather needed information and populate the database that way. That sound good? Any other thoughts before we move on? Did I make that recommendation or someone needs to make the recommendation vote? Motion to vote all in favor? Seven yes. All opposed. One. Are you owe supposed or are you asking a question?

MS. THOMAS: I wasn't paying attention to you.

MR. CAMPANO: We were voting on whether to support it.

MS. THOMAS: We're only voting on we're going to continue and then we will agree later on when the documents change and we all agree on that document, yes, I agree.

MR. CAMPANO: Let me clarify. We're agreeing to this if those changes are put in, everybody gets a chance to see the document to make sure the changes are in as needed, when that's done when that's when it moves on to legislation. How do you vote?

MS. CELESTIN: If this is changed and somebody thinks about it and says I still have a concern about this, they could vote against it at that time.

MS. NEUGEBAUER: Or they can submit their edits. You'll get something, add to it if necessary, ask mark to change it and then we'll send a final thing out.

MR. CAMPANO: I want to make sure everybody had a chance on this level to make sure what the vote is. There would be a second round of voting. And it's still a majority vote, correct?

MS. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. CAMPANO: We record you as yes?

The next one, the screening it is two pages.

MS. NEUGEBAUER: . It has three, but it's only

two.

MR. CAMPANO: Go ahead and take a few minutes to read through that.

MS. RILEY: Mark, it looked like the first one we passed out was one page was the original draft that wasn't completed. So the second first page is really the new first page or the completed first page.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: The one without the title?

MS. RILEY: Correct.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Is the one we should be reading?

MS. RILEY: Correct. Because they're copies of each other.

#01:

MR. CAMPANO: I apologize for the confusion on that. That was my fault.

Looks like everybody had a chance to read this. Has anybody not had a chance to read this? Kathy, do you want to kind of give a little.

MS. RILEY: Sure. So essentially this recommendation is that there be a work group. Not a whole task force, but another work group. Unfortunately I did not get the level of participation that I had wanted and I just did not have time to chase people down to get input. So we started out

pretty strong and then it kind of. I did get Josette from your district a lovely school nurse who called and wanted to be involved and I was very happy about that. So really the recommendation is that a working group including the nurse liaison to DOE be involved in looking at these 11 recommendations and again a lot of this comes from the current research and from what's happening in other states and specifically some of the recommendations are around our older students, middle school and high school who are exposed to lots of sound in shop areas, in band, those kind of things but then also their personal use of headphones and so in the recommendations you'll see consider launching a state wide hearing loss prevention program. That may be a curriculum that all schools use in their health classes. That's what a lot of states do. Or in their science programs. It's not necessarily a separate thing. It's incorporated. It's a curriculum that's incorporated into what schools are already doing. And then of course the use of newer equipment that's around and how that would work. Would it work that districts as their old equipment dies instead of just replacing it with a newer model of a standard screen audiomitor would you be looking at something that has a more useful function and a lot of that is based on

school nurses and school personnel not knowing what's available and what can be used. So these recommendations are really just towards a new work force.

MS. THOMAS: A couple years ago I did send some information to April Mack Greg because I was finding more kids in eighth grade were failing hearing screening. I don't know where where it went with that because she's more stem now than she is science so I can get in touch with her --

MS. RILEY: That might be a good person for the work force.

MS. THOMAS: Like I said she's stem now, but it was a big concern when I had an eighth grader who for the first time failed a hearing screening and it was very upsetting to me. So I will look into that if you want me to and the other thing I noticed on this was that you mentioned calibration in the first page, but it didn't make it on number 12. I know that is a concern a lot of times for the school nurses at least in my district is getting it calibrated.

MS. RILEY: So we'll add that as the 12th thing for them to look at is creating guidelines for calibration of equipment.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I like the idea of having work

group to look at those now 12 items. Can you help me understand the intent. On the fourth paragraph it says it may no longer be best practice to ask school nurses to do the hearing.

MS. RILEY: School news that more job responsibilities because of the complexity of kids that are in their schools that so many are them are finding it overwhelming. They may use some trained paras or audiologists. Some states use speech language pathologists so that it's not solely the owe news of the school nurse to get that information finished. So it's really more around workload.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Would that still be under the direction of the nurse? The nurse would --

MS. RILEY: It could be. I think that's something for the work group to figure out. Again if we're changing the wear the state works and there's educational audiologists, maybe the school nurse needs to be in charge of that this their building and then it goes to, I don't know, speech language pathologist and then up to state wide. I don't know what exactly that might look like. There's a lot of state models to look at, but we don't want to take the school nurse out of it. So many of them are so overwhelmed with the workloads they have.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I was fearful of kids missing a screening because there was no in charge so to speak to make sure it happens. All our plates are all full. We got plates, dessert plates and everything else, but I want to make sure removing that does not remove a kid from the opportunity to be screened.

MS. RILEY: I think most of these talk to more screening rather than less screening of kids which again is going to increase the workload. But that's a good point.

MR. MCKIBBIN: My wife's a school nurse so I love school nurses and like Jose said everybody one has a lot on their plate. This is a man thing, but number 11 when you say they'll report to administrators, could that be administrators slash special administrators? I can see a case where reporting to the principal and then may not go anywhere after that. So I may not be able to get that information as a teacher on that.

MS. RILEY: Good point.

MS. THOMAS: In my district what I do is I send out an Email to all of my school nurses at the beginning of the year and that just says if a child fails your hearing screening, send me an Email and then I get that first run and then I can ask again

because sometimes they fail one day, they don't fail the next and then we're both on the same page at least. So with the working group is that something to talk about too that again not every district has a teacher of the deaf or an educational audiologist or hearing specialist therapist, but --

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I got one thanks to the task force.

MS. THOMAS: Is that something we can talk about in the working group? I think having that person, it just -- it's good because we're following together.

MR. CAMPANO: We are going to have something in code about no stealing staff.

#03: Couldn't you include that with the database?

MR. CAMPANO: Include?

#03: Your concern is that if there's nobody above it, couldn't you add that to the database like a checklist of each school, make sure you do this and that have that in the database.

MR. CAMPANO: We could add something about screening in there. We could send a survey out.

MS. RILEY: Again I would leave that to the working group to kind of come up with a plan and then submit it and it may very well link into the database

in some way, but I don't know that we have enough of the research here right now and the expertise in the room to make all those decisions.

MR. CAMPANO: We want to put a suggestion in for the work group to look at linking this information in the proposal for the state wide database? Is there any further discussion on the database?

MS. RILEY: The database or the screening?

MR. CAMPANO: Screening.

MS. RILEY: We're really recommending another work group.

MR. CAMPANO: Does anybody want to make a motion on voting --

MS. RILEY: Here's my question. So we can recommend if there's a new work group, but then who picks it up and takes charge of that. That's the part I'm missing.

MS. CELESTIN: That's kind of the question I have in terms of are you really recommending that they create another legislative task force to deal with the issues? If you're going to say create a work group, it doesn't have to be a legislative body, then I think there needs to be who is the --

MS. RILEY: Who are the members?

MS. CELESTIN: What agency is the lead of that

and maybe some recommendation about who should be represented on that. So maybe not necessarily the people that you want a representative from an audiologist, a teacher of the deaf, representative from school nurses or DOE state wide D S D. So I think we need to include the list we want and who would be responsible for the that. Is the lead agency state wide or DOE. If you don't put that in there, this would have to be like a legislative task force that would then spell all that out which is I don't think what you're saying here. You want a work group, but there would have to be a lead agency.

MS. RILEY: So I'm making notes. I think that makes more sense too and I don't know if it should be state wide or should it be because it's currently under the nurses should it be like Linda Wolf who's at DOE as a nurse. I know this has not been on the top of her priority list and that's fine because she has a million points too. I guess state wide could do that.

MS. CELESTIN: You could put DOE and say with DOE you could say something like school nurses and exceptional children or something and then DOE would figure out -- I think it does make sense for Linda, but I would be hesitant to put somebody's name so you put school nursing and special population or something

like that.

MS. RILEY: I might be E mailing you for better verbage.

MS. CELESTIN: As long as we have the idea we want to spell out the lead agency and all the players in the recommendation.

MS. RILEY: I was not thinking another legislative action, but just a working group of people who are dedicated to the same goal.

MS. EVANS: What about CDW development?

MS. CELESTIN: Yes.

MS. RILEY: We would have to have people like that pat on there. One of the interesting things I've run into when we were doing this is is we got a little bit side tract because parents and teachers has a federal mandate to screen vision and hearing in all preschoolers and then according to them they got photo-acoustic screeners that they don't know how to use and we talked about doing some workshops and when I did that then sea aid oh, but we want to include everyone who goes into the home with families like -- it just blossomed into this huge workshop that I guess I'm doing for head start and they were talking about -- I can't tell the woman's name right now. Carmen somebody. She's at DOE and she's part of pat so that

was very interesting me. I felt like I was transported to another country. Hands and voices can be part of that because that's another important player in that.

MR. CAMPANO: For the sake of time there's still two more sub points to point out. Are we comfortable at this point to wrap this one up and vote on how it's to be moved next? Do we have a motion to accept this to form a work group?

MS. THOMAS: Yes. Show of hands who's in favor? So that's everybody. Eight's in favor of moving that on as a suggestion.

Being passed now is the staffing. Subcommittee on the staffing it's titled professional grades at this point. Have a minute to read through that. We'll have a discussion afterwards. Anybody need more time in reviewing this before beginning discussion? For the sake of time I'd like to begin this discussion. Andi, you'll be leading?

MS. THOMAS: Yes. So our subcommittee was charged with staffing qualification and unfortunately Doreen was unable to be here, but she was a monumental help in collection of data and working with us as a team and disseminating information out but unfortunately with it being race weekend and her

having a young child it didn't work with her for her to be able to make it in time. So we were charged with what should we do and I don't know what works best because I know we're running out of time. If everyone had a chance to read it, I'm going to say do you have questions or comments or not clear about certain things.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: The first question I have is in reference to number 2 where it says interpreters will be considered highly qualified and again I don't know the intent because I wasn't involved in the conversation, but I would think that that would be dealt with through certification and that should be done through our human resource offices not necessarily dictating qualifying scores and E I P A scores because we have a hard enough time trying to find personnel to serve in those roles and if we start to weed them out by specific qualifications, we may do a disservice to our students.

MS. CELESTIN: I was going to add if I'm wondering if the recommendation here is that you want -- is this something that you want the professional standards board to take up like outlining these are going to be the qualifications to be considered highly qualified or is the intention that that's already done

and I don't know maybe that's already done and your intention is really more making sure these folks are paid on the teacher pay scale.

MS. THOMAS: Theirs goes into effect 2016. So that was already the standards. The requirement is already there.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Not until 2016?

MS. THOMAS: Right. There was a grandfather of five years and it went into legislation in 2011 is when it starts. We were just saying this. What happened in a lot of districts up until 2016 has to end is you didn't have to have any kind of certification, qualification. There have been people who have had very limited signing skills who have worked and with that you could get into the district pay as a para.

MS. CELESTIN: When that was voted on back in 2011 and that went forward as these are going to be the qualifications beginning in 2016, was it specified in that that once folks are meeting these qualifications they would be considered on the teacher pay scale?

MR. MCKIBBIN: That's not in the regs. When she was here at the last meeting she was talking about how Christina does it so they have to pass Praxis to get

the teacher pay scale. So that has closed the door to a lot of qualified interpreters. We want something to say if you have this certification requirement but didn't have the Praxis per se that you could be hired and be on the teacher pay scale rather than some different pay scale or as a para professional which happened in some cases.

MS. RILEY: Currently some districts require the interpreters to take the Praxis before they take the job. There are interpreters who like me if they had to take the Praxis today would be scared to death, plus the money, et cetera. So I think part of it was looking at how do we make sure qualified interpreters are really good be at job and should be in those positions are not kicked out of the system solely based on that Praxis, but if they have their Bachelor's degree, they have their certification, you know, they have those two certifications, then maybe they don't have to take the Praxis. The only thing we put in there take the Praxis within two years because I know for me I would have to have tutoring in math for the Praxis. If you gave it to me today, I'll be like oh, my God. I haven't done this in 20 years. Sarah Sarah so is it that you're saying you don't have to do all three things, you have to do two of the

following, is that different than what was voted by the board.

MS. THOMAS: I wish she was here because she is the interpreter. My understanding it was the three was the part that was an add-on. As of 2016 you have to have a Bachelor's degree in something. There's no specification as to what the Bachelor's degree is in and you need to come with E ID certification.

MS. RILEY: I think what you're asking is in some districts they are requiring the Praxis, in some districts they are not and so what some districts are saying and I think that's an HR thing and I don't know how to address that is that they can't be on the teacher pay scale if they don't take the Praxis.

MS. CELESTIN: This goes back to professional standards board because it makes the recommendation to the state board about what exactly is required. So right now maybe it's unclear about Praxis so that schools, locals are making that decision whether they're going to require that or not, but I think coming from us we can't as a body say --

MS. RILEY: We would say professional.

MS. CELESTIN: We would have to recommend that professional standards board revise the requirements to the follow. We can't say that we're changing this

to the following because this has to be done by professional standards board. The state board has to vote on it and then they have to change the regulations related to this.

MS. RILEY: We need to word it differently.

MS. CELESTIN: Agree. I agree with this. I agree with what you're saying. I think we need to word to to say that our recommends that professional standards board revise the qualifications to the following including changes to the regulation so that to make it clear to districts that if interpreters are meeting all of these things, then they should be paid as a teacher.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: And adding to that if something has already been voted on and it's going to go into effect in 2016, maybe make a note of that because maybe not everybody reading this may be aware of that.

MS. RILEY: I think that goes back to the whole thing about oversight of regulations 1574. I think when the group started meeting they saw that there were already standards in place that aren't necessarily being followed. It's not that standards need to be created, but that standards are not being -- and I know I had a situation this year where I had an administrator say to me well, if the person has a

teacher of the deaf degree, that trumps interpreting and she can be an interpreter. I said no, they're two different degrees with two different skillsets. You can't trade them out. So I think Jose, the thing is that you'll see in some of the other recommendations the thought that there would be ongoing trainings or workshop around special ed director meetings where that's reviewed so that everyone understands what the rules are, what the changing regulars are and know what to do with the information because I think you're right. I think there's lots of people that change, people retire and people come in and not everybody knows exactly what's happening.

MS. CELESTIN: I think Kathy to get what you're talking about now numbers 1 and 3 which are regarding the oversight of the regulation and mandatory professional development for special ed and HR directors, I'm thinking these would fall under the office of certification. I can't speak to what training the office of certification provides. I know they have regular meetings with the HR directors and go over any of the regulatory changes to certification. I guess the wording that makes me a little bit concerned is in number 3 when it says an annual schedule of mandatory professional development.

I think they have a schedule of HR director meetings and they could certainly speak to when they're going to provide training to them. I don't think that they have really the -- they can't mandate -- the department, it's not -- it's very rare that the department is able to mandate that all special ed directors or all HR directors have to -- would have to come and attend these training on these certifications. We can leave that wording. I just don't know likely it is. I think that we can say that there has to be training on this regularly with HR directors or special ed directors. Realistically I'm not sure how that would work. So I keep trying to think about how to word that in a different way, but I think, you know, we can recommend that. I'm just not sure how that would happen.

MS. THOMAS: Is there some kind of contact whether it be Email that they do to disseminate information to? You know what I mean? It could be some kind of wording. However they share the changes if that's on that same document.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Sometimes as a director I won't necessarily have to know every specific as far as certification because they're not going to let me hire somebody unless they meet those qualifications.

MS. RILEY: In your district.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: That's my case. I'll take that back. Erase all of that.

Are you going on to a different question?

MS. THOMAS: I have.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I have another questions for number 6. This is for clarification. This talks about the audiologist and the teachers of the deaf and I'm not sure because I'm not sure of their certification credential and expertise. Are they able to do that? Is that something that --

MS. THOMAS: . Yes. I can give you a little history. Back in the day I've been here 18 years we used to if a child was up for eligibility we would have to go to the audiologist to public health or to Kathy and have them sign as the evaluation specialist. Then it became that teachers of the deaf or audiologist are the ones who are able to --

MS. RILEY: Have the background and training and I think the problem is around districts that don't have anybody in their district to support kids with hearing loss who are using -- I was just at a meeting where a very lovely and competent bilingual school psychologist gave a lovely report, a lot to do and then at the end she said I am certifying that this

child qualifies as a child with hearing loss and I'm like really because you don't know what any of that says about hearing loss. So I think that's the problem is that there are districts who are using unqualified people to say that kids qualify or don't qualify for services.

MS. CELESTIN: I agree with no. 6. I think the only thing we need to add to that just so there's no confusion is that if a student has multiple disabilities. So yes, educational audiologists or teachers of the deaf could be the eval specialist related specifically to the hearing impairment, but for a student with multiple disabilities, a school psychologist still needs to be there as the evaluation specialist. I think depending on how this went out to people somebody could miss interpret that somebody has hearing impairment you could serve as the specialist for everything. I think we need to put a little something there to clarify.

I don't know if there's anything else on number 6.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: That's all.

MS. EVANS: I actually have a question about number six because I work with the evaluation specialist or the professionals, the teachers of the

deaf have to sign up on that, the evaluation so they have a special ed teacher. They can't do both. You can't have it both ways then.

MS. CELESTIN: Jean is correct. You can't be the special ed teacher and the evaluation specialist. So in this case you would need an educational audiologist to sign off as the evaluation specialist. You wouldn't be able to have your special ed teacher and be the evaluation specialist as well.

MS. RILEY: Correct.

MS. CELESTIN: What you're speaking to is would there be a case where you would sign in multiple places as the student's special ed teacher and the evaluation specialist? You would be signing as --

MS. THOMAS: No.

MS. CELESTIN: And then they would have another special ed teacher.

MS. THOMAS: I'm thinking about my case load and my kids are on team with regular teacher and special ed teachers.

MS. EVANS: Sometimes at the meeting we have an audiologist and you have a teacher of the deaf and the teacher of the deaf would sign under the special ed teacher and the audiologist would sign in the other section but if you don't have a teacher of the deaf,

what would you do in that situation?

MS. CELESTIN: You have the audiologist signing as they value specialist, if there's no teacher of the deaf, who would normally have sign as the teacher there? Just the general Ed teacher?

MS. EVANS: No. You have to have a special education teacher. That's a requirement. You have the three of them.

MS. RILEY: There's a very different animal if let's say the school for the deaf when there's a trienal, then I'm there to sign as an evaluation specialist although often the psychologist still signs there. That's just a pet peeve. And then the teachers many of whom are teachers of the deaf are signing as special ed teachers out in the district say in Andi's case she goes in as the teacher of the deaf there will also be at that meeting a special ed teacher who serves that child if they're in special ed. Andi signs as the evaluation specialist because that's her role in that meeting. You have to have enough people to fill all those roles.

MS. THOMAS: The concern is and I'm not sure if that's the question what if you have an audiologist that doesn't have a teacher there?

MS. CELESTIN: In a district that doesn't have a

teacher for the deaf I would think you would have an audiologist and then their general Ed and special ed teacher would sign. That's a requirement. I think Jean's question is there would a situation where the teacher of the deaf could signed as they value specialist. You cannot. You have to have two different parties for that. So even though we're saying on this teacher of the deaf could be recognized as any value specialist, that would only be the case if there was another special ed teacher signing as special ed. You couldn't have the teacher of the deaf signing as they value specialist and the special ed teacher. That's a federal rule.

MR. MCKIBBIN: Just because I've been at the school for the deaf for so long what would be the situation if the only issue for the child is hearing impairment so I'm a hearing special ed teacher?

MS. RILEY: No. You sign as a teacher of the deaf.

MS. THOMAS: I do have a couple kids who it is -- I'm their only goal, but they are still on the team with the additional support of special ed. So they're still a special ed teacher who serves my kid even though the updates are all mine if that makes any sense.

MR. CAMPANO: A quick note before the next person goes on. I want to respect the conversation add the importance of it, but we still have a lot more to go through and this is intended to be our last meeting so folks keep that in mind as we continue the conversation.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Last question I promise, number 8 I think is very difficult to define reasonable in any language and I think that any type of case load should be left up to the district.

MS. THOMAS: Our charge was to determine case load and what we were finding was we really couldn't determine case load because there were so many impacting factors that we tried to answer the question that we were asked to answer in the past way that we could with what we had.

MS. RILEY: That's why we put a range in there what we heard. One district that is 66 kids on her case load. There is no way that she can serve all those kids and parents are upset because the district has the been. In special ed this this many to this many. There has to be some guideline for that. There are districts that have enough hard of hearing kids and refuse to do so. So what do we do with that?

MS. CELESTIN: I was concerned what we were

recommending a reasonable case load must be determined. Were we recommending that there is another work group or are we taking -- I would more in favor of saying some kind of guidance like the case load must be determined based on thinking about the level of need of the student and you guys have some of this language here, complexity of load, additional disability, travel time and so on and then maybe put a maximum not to exceed a maximum of it looks like you have 35 here. So you're still trying to put a cutoff so that somebody can't have 60 students, but you're saying that the district or school is determining case load based on complexity of needs.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: The range of what's recommended not necessarily. It encompasses all the things that you listed, 36 pay have been okay.

MS. CELESTIN: If there's a recommended range based on national best practice.

MS. RILEY: That's what we did. We looked at other states and some of them are extremely specific if the kid is in regular Ed 8 percent of the time, you get this many kids. The math around it is very overwhelming. So we were trying to avoid that. How we came up with a range thinking about that this also includes deaf-blind kids who are much more significant

and have a higher level of need so that could be as low as 10 kids for somebody and then thinking about it there's also a lot of kids in the districts out there who just need equipment checks, monthly Emails with the teachers, teacher and servicing that are on your case list I.

MS. CELESTIN: I just need to say that it's the recommendation that the local districts or whatever determine the cases based on all of these factors with a recommended range of this not to exceed. I think giving those parameters.

MS. THOMAS: I'm more comfortable about that.

MS. RILEY: Your perspective as a special ed director is important.

MS. THOMAS: Does anyone have any other questions? It looks like we're going to make some changes to the verbage with some help from others and then we'll send it out to everyone. Do we need to vote on that?

MS. CELESTIN: We've been voting on the other one.

MR. CAMPANO: I think the way Tracy explained before with the change we'll vote and every gets to see it after the changes and say yes, those are the changes. Is there a motion to vote?

MS. CELESTIN: Motion.

MR. CAMPANO: To accept with edits how many in favor? That's unanimous. With edits and then we edit again later.

That was the staffing one. Public comment will start in 18 minutes. We also only have until four o'clock. If this next section doesn't come to a resolve by four, there's a couple of things that we may need to look at on what to look at. Do we go past four o'clock? Do we meet again? There's been a lot of difficulty in getting enough work done on it to have some sort of draft today. In talking to Quinn, Mike Jackson and Karen field-Rogers yesterday what they talked about as long as we come together with the concept on this and draft the concept out, we can submit that and work on it from there. So this last part is one page or one page front and back. It's talking about or it's addressing the following issues around this creating the first task force to create a separate entity to work through the state, to come out from underneath Christina school district, to have more staff and units to be able to do it. In discussing this as a larger group, discussing this with some input from the subcommittees and also talking to those three folks yesterday what we came up

with all the options that were then presented, the six options in the beginning working all the way down to three and then yesterday the suggestion led Mike suggested to propose the idea and we'll walk through this. So what we came up in looking for structural issues creating consortium, a state wide program for deaf hard of hearing and deaf blind to become a consortium. It will be a lot more involved with that reporting budgetary and everything else, but just to start with the conversation of state wide programs becoming its own, basically its own district, becoming a consortium to provide those services throughout the entire state. I'll keep going if you want. Did you have a question, Sarah?

MS. CELESTIN: I do, but I feel like I missed something somewhere. I thought that where we were was thinking about state wide staying under Christina school district and then building capacity within that like building out more staffing. You're saying this recommendation is to create a separate consortium outside of the district? Am I understanding that correct?

MR. CAMPANO: This is the recommendation that came down with Karen, Mike and Quinn yesterday staying out of the district, doing partial unit count option

and all the things I presented to this them this is what they came up with to meet what we were trying to achieve they suggest we discuss and look at the concept of a consortium would then be able to do everything we're asking about.

MS. CELESTIN: I'm sorry. Who would this consortium report to? It would be reporting -- we've explored the idea of a separate entity reporting to the governors's office, reporting to the DOE. You're saying its own L E A with its own local board? Is that what you're saying.

MR. CAMPANO: I'm not familiar with consortium. The way they explained was it has its own board they would report to.

MS. CELESTIN: There isn't anything like this.

MR. CAMPANO: The Sussex consortium? It doesn't work that way? We would be familiar with the Christina school district. It would be underneath it, it would be the governing agency like governance? You're saying it's totally wrong?

MR. MCKIBBIN: Consortium as I understand it in Sussex is almost like the name of the program is under the district. So it's not a separate own board.

MS. CELESTIN: It's not a separate consortium. The principal and assistant principals report to the

school district. So they're not separate from the district at all and they don't have their own board. It sounds like what they're recommending is to become its own L E A with its own board.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: It sounds like that's what they're recommending.

MS. CELESTIN: I guess why I'm so surprised when we had the presentation from Christina school district and we talked about all the costs associated with separating out from the district that all the costs in terms of the overhead and the fiscal, all of the HR and all that just the financial side of this is going to be very, very difficult. So I guess that's where I'm surprised where we are now.

MR. CAMPANO: My understanding from the conversation yesterday was that it could still be housed, polly tech or Christina school district, it could still be housed there to run the business end of it and the units would still flow through because the systems are already in place. They talked about because I present the idea of the governors office or board much like the autism task force is presenting to have a board and I mentioned those are the things we had talked about they kind of shrunk it down to this and they specifically said they would be a board of

consortium to push everything through and there wouldn't be duplication of payroll and HR because it would already be set.

MS. CELESTIN: You're saying it would still be under the district.

MR. CAMPANO: Yes.

MR. MCKIBBIN: Not an elected board. A board of professionals?

MR. CAMPANO: This would be some of the details we talked about in the sense of that would be filled in. This was not going to be answered today. There was not enough information and get folks to meet as many times as we've asked about financial components. It took me a couple of weeks to be able to sit down yesterday to get this meeting and that was going through Quinn to get it. There hasn't been enough discussion at least from my perspective to nail this out and talking to them yesterday this is the idea they came up with. So we need to do a lot of work on this to see what we want to do or not do with this and go back to what we were talking about.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Completely appreciate your hard work and dedication on this, but going back to the numbers of time we've met as a task force I thought this was off the table and I think when we talked

about whether it was going to be under the governors office or stay with Christina or the different options I believe we looked at a task force we said it was going to stay with Christina and see how we can make this better for all without pulling it ought together and without having a separate board. Maybe I missed something in a number of task force meetings that we've had, but I thought that was the direction that we as a task force team decided to go.

MS. CELESTIN: What I'm hearing stay under Christina but have a board and I know some of the other task force they've talked about a commission think would be a board that is taking up issues and getting reports from that entity. That would be like this state wide program if you want to call it consortium, this group would report to this board. The term I've heard in other task forces is board but gets reports from state wide program, child change, budget, all of this is kind of advisory. They have a capacity to they're giving feedback to the state wide program, making recommendations almost like an advisory board. I think one of the key differences I looked down under number two and it says the director of the state wide program will report to the consortium board. I think that's problematic. You're

staying under a district your director would be reporting to whoever the person is in that district based on the personnel hierarchy. They weren't be reporting to the board because that would then mean you have a staff under a district who are reporting to a separate board which doesn't make sense to me. If you're standing under Christina, I could see having some time of advisory board or commission that state wide programs is reporting to to give feedback on the program and on the things on your strategic goals, but not be reporting in in terms of somebody actually like a director actually reporting to them for personnel reasons. That doesn't really make sense to me.

MR. MCKIBBIN: Looking down further we were looking about unit count and it looks like this new entity could be hearing all the deaf, deaf blind and itinerant teachers in the state based on a variety of different formulas there. Is that what that's saying?

MR. CAMPANO: No. Let me run through this quickly then and we can negate it, change it, go back to whatever. Essentially what we were talking about was creating its own separate entity to be able to provide everything that was asked on the first task force, be able to provide services throughout the state. The consortium is staying under Christina

district school, then we change code to make that more accessible. Number two, talked about having the core team as we've discussed in the past identifying what the core team would be but then set up the state wide entity to be able to provide services throughout the entire state. In that core team we've talked about thus far at least in the bigger group is a director and the two coordinators, one for deaf and hard of hearing, one for deaf blind. There's been some discussion behind that. Does that stay as a coordinator for deaf blind and deaf hard of hearing or if that becomes one entity, and then assistant coordinator of some sort or multiple levels of administration. That's never been defined. There also needs to be some other titles and roles put in there as what might be a need for a core team beyond something that unit count would raise. So something along the lines of data, the data person, the data specialist, the community outreach person, the family Ed staff and then underneath that 2 B talks about union counts for teachers of the deaf. Serving 78 kids logistically does not fit on the schedule at all. They are working maximized kids without breaks. It's in there. So we need, actually need a formula for the teachers of the deaf and deaf blind teachers

to say what would be an appropriate ratio to provide those services. There isn't anything in place for we just discussed a few times to talk about that ratio or that case load based on basic intents and complex needs of our students. Underneath complex which is. Teachers of the deaf I put down one unit for every 12 complex students regardless of deaf hard of hearing deaf blind. If they're complex and they provide a weekly service, you'd have to have a ratio at that level. And then it also likes at simplify the code instead of getting too complex with this have one unit for 20 students deaf and hard of hearing we talked about that range before anywhere from 10 to 35 how would you create the units to have enough staff to do that job. So we pick somewhere in the middle say 20. So you have complex kids, basic kids and a mixture thereof, a ratio of 20 would hopefully be enough staff to meet those needs. State wide coordinator for hard of hearing and deaf blind and are they being uses by D S D, would D S D get to capitalize on this. So there are questions about putting into code and qualifying state wide units and their roles and how they're used. The so the next part C talks about the separation still working together, but the separation especially funding wise how those students come in and what they

get used for. It also mentioned in there too the coordinators. State wide coordinators are not necessarily part of site wise program such as D S D north or south once it gets established, but provide consultative services the same as they would everyone else. Fee for services how they're set in place and how they'll fund that. Code formula or unit code formula that went when over in 2 B for earning units that teachers of the deaf, deaf blind and fill that need. For the local dollars some sort of fee for services and Karen field Rogers talked about meeting, some sort of range to differentiate because what happens now the way code is written and Bill silver presented this in chapter 6 it's just one free for service. Some of the concerns for D S D and state wide services is if a student goes to D S D and stays in the residential program, that fee is exactly the same as a student to gets one hour of somewhere a month somewhere else in the state and it's not equitable and it also puts a bad name on D S D and state wide programs. So part of the recommendation is for the local portion of this for the students that aren't covered by state that it has to be a charging system. Karen mentioned four levels of just four blocks. So a district has this come out, provide some

service. I actually put five down. If it calls in one of these levels of services, you'd be charged X amount of dollars as a set amount based in code.

MS. RILEY: So that would be a way in which small districts like wood bridge or some of those districts that don't have enough kids to have their own itinerant could get some services for those kids using the state wide team and using a fee for service model?

MR. CAMPANO: Yes. They don't have to give up an entire unit. It's from the state. It's not being -- it's been a partial skimming off the top, a partial unit. It's just units written into code for the core team and a fee for services for the local portion of it depending on what level of services they request. The next part where it breaks down site based with residential component obviously would be charged. If a student's charged at D S D, it's a unit because they provide all the services. Now, if they also have a residential component to it, it should be an additional fee for that. If it's just site based with no residential component, it's just a unit that's already set up. That's not changing anything in the second one. If it's itinerant ongoing services weekly or bi-weekly program such as the deaf blind program,

there's another level as of how much service should pertain to. Shouldn't be as costly. You have students on a deaf blind census that have once a month or once every two months services. Underneath whatever state wide programs. So I put E in there as just the assessment center. If a district doesn't need full on services.

MS. RILEY: Triennial or something.

MR. CAMPANO: Once a year, some sort of assessment process done. So a fee should be set up for that where it's not necessarily again taking all that away. Part of having the units built in to code for the core team is how the the deaf blind program's been able to travel across district lines to provide services whereas it's been said in the past Christina school district that we can't necessarily take from the students in the building that for those kids it will provide services for kids elsewhere and it's also been a concern of the quitibility for the key of services.

Code to ensure outreach. There was questions put in and brought to us from the different subcommittees. The deaf blind team is on the subcommittee. Share best practice. So on the IEP programs they create services. The teams and the

families have access to them at all times, provide continuing support to the families and districts. The districts are still in charge and responsible for the students, but they're at the table on the IEPs as related service to make sure the support is in place.

To be at the able for transition meetings, so that those best practices can continue throughout their services from birth through 21. Same as the deaf blind program does now. We know the kid. We can keep that information going and we can help not reinvent the wheel as things go on. A couple things on the back. Number five define the services to be provided by state wide. There's a long list that Lori had presented to different groups in the state as well as the task force. A big list of services we have we want to be able to do with state wide programs. We have that list and we can go over that list again, but then it was suggested to to look at breaking those services down so which one would be the fee for service and which ones were part what's being collected now. So essentially the discussion was based on without additional costs would be all the workshops, and all the professional development that's not really student specific. It's not coaching a staff around a student. Not necessarily consult with

the student but rather larger things that could be done. Then looking down at what would warrant fee for service after the state portion and that would be technical assistance that would be on a weekly basis, once a month, once every two months, stuff that we mentioned on the front side.

Last thing in there there was a lot of discussion around and need for equipment or assistance technology. So a testimony for equipment to follow the student and not to follow the district money. If there's equipment based at the centralized entity, as it's needed it can be loaned, repaired, updated, purchased new equipment to then follow the students wherever they go. I just want to put that out and paint a little clearer of a picture or bigger of a picture. Sarah, you had your hand up and.

MS. CELESTIN: I want to say I appreciate all the time that was put in it and I agree with the funding piece of it looking at specific state units for core team, having a unit count obviously that needs to be fleshed out a little bit more and then having fee for services to cover the local portion because I think that will help the concerns that were expressed by Christina school district when they were saying we're making on more. I think fees for service

would help with that. I think one of the things I recommend we need to separate out under fee for service where it says A and B site base that's tuition for Delaware school for the deaf so I feel like I do agree that there needs to be some differential of residential versus not residential, that should be separated out, but I think because we're trying to have clarity between D S D and state wide I would separate that out. So that's clearly related to tuition residential versus none residential and that could help out where you could have four levels there for fee or service or state wide.

Related to number four the code we could have more discussion off line whether this belongs in code or whether this belongs in M O U. I know for other state wide entities for blind and D I I know this is outlined in M O U for school districts and charters. I think that's something we can talk about. I want to say in terms of the financial I agree with this. I just would like -- I would rather see it stay under Christina. I would be in favor of that I B M and advisory board of something, but I think to set up a totally separate board that the state wide is reporting to I think is going to start to get a little hairy.

MS. THOMAS: Going back two things number one on the list that we definitely need to make sure we define are we doing -- what about the audit logicals. If I'm bringing my child to your building, is that considered under technical assistance which is considered under the free part.

MS. RILEY: Is there a charge.

MS. THOMAS: Is there a charge or is there no charge to the district because obviously I'm bringing the child to you because the family cannot or is not doing it themselves. Just kind of want to clarify all that just to make sure.

MS. RILEY: That never came on my radar.

MS. THOMAS: Because you're not me.

MR. CAMPANO: I think a lot of -- there's a lot of details not here and it has to be fleshed out whether that goes under assessment center or whether that's the state wide thing because if you look at it from state wide thing everybody coming up, there's probably going to be an influx, but if that falls under the assessment center, that can be set up as a minimal fee for service and I think what they were talking about was you buy into the fee tour service at whatever level and you get that for your district. Whether it's buying into the assessment center once

you've brought that, it's up, but that kind of thing detail wise we would have to work on obviously.

MS. THOMAS: The other thing I just need for clarification between having just the deaf-blind coordinator and the deaf-hard of hearing coordinator. You were explaining that in the beginning whether it would be one coordinator and someone under the coordinator and just was not quite understanding it because obviously for me as a teacher of the deaf we have some of the same scope just like Kathy and I, we have some of the same scope, but then we off shoot to just making sure that everybody is protected with the right staffing.

MR. CAMPANO: I don't know about protected part, but basically what's been happening the deaf blind program is different from the deaf hard of hearing outreach. We need to really pull those two outreach programs together to make one outreach program. So if we do that what happens to those titles that are in code now so we pay hire a coordinator of deaf hard of hearing, we may hire a coordinator of deaf blind program. The code recommendation is that you shall hire someone for these positions, but then the question has been discussed in the past in the Christina school district, I'm not sure about here but

conversations out of the larger group what does that mean if we're not sigh lowing, what kind of coordinators do we need, what should those titles be? Should it stay by the cat ignoral approach? In the beginning of the task force we talked about assessment center and outreach center and then D S D as a state wide program too in the beginning was to be separated and now we're kind of talking about not totally pulling away from it, but still clearly defining it. So that to answer that question there it's really I guess semantics on what we're going to call those two roles so it's not sigh lowed anymore. It's not separated by deaf blind, deaf blind hard of hearing. If we separate that up, then we've got two administersers balancing the case load of all the kids.

MS. THOMAS: I think when you talk about professional development and --

MS. RILEY: We need to have both professional.

MS. THOMAS: You need to have both. Your heart is a very different scope than my part. So when it comes to certain needs, certain trainings there are some that either you or Lori could do, but there are things that you're not as abreast of that someone else who might be deaf and hard of hearing coordinator

would be. I think that's important that if we're going to increase the numbers, we need to increase the service.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I really like the idea for the free for services and the opportunity to go across lines. I love the fact with technology seasons, assessment center that districts can access like this year we lost our itinerant teacher. Is he went to another position. Thankfully we've been able to hire someone to start for the next school year, but have we had the opportunity to do that this year, that would have been wonderful. So I do like that component of it. I'm not so sure that in order to have that we have to remove from under Christina all together and I'm not sure if that's necessary. I think we can still do those great things and still have the state wide program be under Christina.

My second question or comment would be under the unit count piece which is your 2 B I would recommend that you put 2 B 3 and then 1. I would highly recommend that we look at your or to simplify the code for one unit per X number of students and not utilize the complex intense and basic language because in most districts, well, I can only speak for mine, most of our kids that receive haven't are not going to be

under the complex language, however we will have the numbers that would generate the unit, but we would not have them based on the complex. So we may have 20 students that are receiving services, but not 12 that are receiving services under the complex label and I think that would hurt districts. Sarah is an is a they can be complex for another reason.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Under the funding mechanism now.

This is a blanket question for the task force here. Last thing I'm going to say under the code language that you have here for 4 I think the recommendations for those that are receiving the services that be listed on the IEP as a related service. Is that not being done state wide? For us that's common practice that we actuality actually list it as a common practice.

MS. THOMAS: How it has been in the past being a special ed teacher you could be under related service I actually asked DOE where do they want it and the response was as long as it's on there.

MS. CELESTIN: We have said over the last year we really want to see this under related service and not just for hearing, but also for students who are impaired and receiving orientation ability, all of

that should be listed under related service, but I think that is to Andi's point that is newer. People were either not -- before the guidance was as long as it's on there and we can see where it's reflected because people aren't putting it on there at all so then we started to see it all over the place. Now we're saying you should put this under related service. Under related service you can run a report from IEP plus to say I have this many students that need hearing services and that would help with the district to plan for when they look at fee for service what they need to plan out in that you are budget. So I think we really wanted to have districts move this information to related service. That way they can run a report.

I have a really quick note. Number one when you refer to state wide programs I think that there is kind of a connotation out there when you hear programs that people think about D S D and the actual program versus services. So I'm just wondering maybe if we should recommend it to be called state wide services instead of state wide program. I know we've heard in this task force a lot of concern about those things being blurred. Any way that we can try to make it clear I think it would help.

MR. CAMPANO: Let me kind of go over something quick. In the first part no consortium. Let's go back and pick something to make a recommendation of this this is going to report to. The original task force was very clear in saying to move the money to Christina school district because there was a lot of barriers. If we create the right code that might bring those barriers down. Open up doors to be able to provide those services. The consortium idea we'll cross that off and we'll take about in a minute hopefully. We'll just leave that underneath Christina.

The other part is state wide programs change to state wide services but to make sure we're on the same page now because there's Ben many names passed away and the the connotation being the empire taking over unit count kids everywhere and what's being provided D S D is a site wide service. It's site-based state wide service. There was clarification from the first task force to the second one to keep D S D with state wide as a state wide program underneath. So would the task force agree to the thought of the labelling, semantics out state wide services as the entity, D S D is one component, the assessment and outreach is kind of that other component we talked about in the

beginning, what we've been calling state wide or is there another way we need to look at all that?

MS. CELESTIN: I'm just thinking about the other tuition-based schools. If you think about Brennan, they take kids from all over just pretty much New Castle County and then you have other kids from consortium or whatever program, but they just refer to themselves by the name of their school and there's people coming there that are on a tuition-base. I think about Delaware school for the deaf as the school and they have kids coming from throughout the state that are choosing that and they are tuition base versus when you say state wide I don't think about D S D as state wide. I know there's kids that go there from other places in the state, but as soon as I hear state wide I'm thinking of what you're describing as the services, outreach beyond the actual school site. So I don't know. We could reframe that, but I worry when you say state wide as the bigger umbrella I'm not sure that everybody thinks about the school D S D as state wide. I think the state wide we're thinking more about the actual services that are going out to other districts.

MS. RILEY: A couple things.

MR. CAMPANO: I want to jump in quick because of

time maybe the part of the title we should save for another time.

MS. RILEY: I do think there needs to be in this document some clear safe guards around units and money and that is everyone's greatest fear is that the state wide units or the money that's generated to serve and support kids out in their regular placements will be usurped and used on campus at D S D. I've heard that from many people. The other thing that I wondered about that didn't see and maybe that goes back under the staff recommendations, but about we have on here about one unit for every 20 students, but when we look at interpreters we have to write that out very, very differently because most interpreters have to be one on one with students. So it has to be written very clearly and I was trying to think about it is there a way it doesn't set out A or B or C, it would automatically be one or one, but it could be one on one if you're in a special school too, because you can be a kid at Charlton who has a one on one interpreter. So I'm not sure how to write that, but we need to have that piece in there and I agree with you, Sarah. I think we should take out the site-based part and just look at those assistive technology assessment and take out the other stuff and the other piece that's in

there I really think is the safeguard we need to think about is right now both state wide coordinators have a lot of their time used up with building management for D S D. Coverage, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. They are not supposed to be those people, but they were yanked and used all the time which then lessened their ability to serve districts and so I really think that needs to be strongly put in there that they are not part of -- even if their office is on that campus, that they are not part of the management of D S D.

MS. CELESTIN: I think that's the best way.

MR. CAMPANO: Considering it's 3:51 we've been waiting for the public. At least at five of I'm going to stop all conversation and talk about what's next.

PUBLIC: Who so regulates if you said it's suggested to the N L U as opposed to having us be separate to do district services, who requires the district to agree to that and to following that M O U to get the services for the kids? They have students that are in that district and not receiving services. Do they have to have M O U with us? Who's going to make sure that that happens?

MS. CELESTIN: Maybe I need to clarify what I was saying. I was really talking about the things that are under number 4 in terms of representatives

from state wide services need to be an I P meetings and all that, those are the things that go into M O U and that's agreed upon between state wide services, all of the students and then the department usually has the responsible to getting that information out to make sure that special ed directors and folks that work under them have an understanding of that. This is more of kind of the working process in terms of invitation to see meetings, who's responsible for making sure that certain people are invited to meetings and all of that. It's not -- that would be what would be an M O U. The M O U would not be about making sure that districts were buying into services. So that would be outlined in code that districts and charters have the opportunity to buy into these types of services when they have a student that needs them. That would be in code, but the working like the working relationship in terms of who's going to be responsible for sending a meeting notice and making sure that all the entities are at the table, what are the timelines for that, those are the kinds of things that go into M O U. I don't know if I'm maybe misunderstanding.

PUBLIC: Who's going to be in charge of having services available?

MS. RILEY: Theoretically I think it should work, I'm not sure I understand M O Us completely that state wide someone should be invited to the table at the I P meeting. I think once that representative is there and is providing what's best practice in terms of services you would think that the natural outcome of the IEP would be to provide some level of service and that personal from state wide might be saying well, if you don't have your own teacher, there's an opportunity for to you do fee for service.

MS. CELESTIN: I understand the question better. The legal answer to is that the district is responsible and say the I. E P says students needs this and district didn't provide, it the district would be liable for that because they are the district serving that student and they have the responsibility for finding the provider themselves. If they didn't have that to contracting with state wide or some other contract --

PUBLIC: I'm not allowed to I can't provide a service right now. It's hard for us to stay under Christina school district to provide a whole state wide service when we're not allowed to go to the state. How would that work?

MR. CAMPANO: If we get these units created and

they come from the state, that would then open up positions like yours and the deaf-blind team, they already go out because it's a state funded unit. It's not a building unit.

PUBLIC: That's where I was.

MR. CAMPANO: That would open it up to provide for services.

MS. RILEY: Right now you're a building unit. That's why you can't do that.

MS. CELESTIN: That's why Kathy made a good point of saying these units have to be protected. You don't want a situation where there's units being generated. These units are -- even if you have an office in the building, you're really meant to be out and about all over. So there would be dedicated units that are generated that are for working with other districts.

PUBLIC: Are there going to be requirements for a teacher of the deaf and hard of hearing.

MS. RILEY: 1574 already says that. That was our thing about increased oversight and enforcement. We thought there weren't any. They already existed. Nobody's paying attention.

PUBLIC: How do we fix the problems with the districts that aren't paying attention?

MS. THOMAS: Go to the office of the certification. It actually started at 20111.

MR. CAMPANO: I'd like to ask if the task force would be willing to stay at least another 15, 20 minutes. Whoever can stay because this is left too open ended. My thoughts. We need to solidify something and take some sort of next steps. If there's at least seven members that stay, are we okay with coming up with taking this changing this and coming up with some sort of next step. It sounds like there's going to be an agreement to edit and electronically going out to vote on the edits. I don't think we can put it on. This is the kind of work that's needed for a while.

MR. MCKIBBIN: I think there's a lot of good things that I'd like them to talk about for years with the state wide services. It seems like this is leading and probably this should have been our second meeting after we did the outreach. We spent a lot time on this part. I think what we recommended earlier the code changes and language changes and definitions, that should go forward. To me this almost seems like another task force just to look at this piece. There's pieces in here because I'm seeing it for the first time I'm not sure about yet what it

would all mean for services for fee, for state wide, for itinerant teachers, for interpreters. What would go under D S D, what wouldn't. I think those are all really big issues.

MR. CAMPANO: What was told to me by Mike Jackson the controller general if we can give them the concept they can hash out those details and it would be a work group or another task force to do that. This isn't about getting anything else to D S D. This is separating out and defining that and I agree there needs to be more work done on it.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Not that I want to add to anybody's workload, but I almost wish that we can just have one more meeting to really have the opportunity to die guest this, bring it back to the table and again I know it's the end of the school year and it may be tough, but if we can have one more meeting just to focus on this in particular I think it would do a better -- do us better than to recommend another task force.

MS. RILEY: I agree.

MR. CAMPANO: I agree and I'm more than willing to meet tonight and the beverages can come immediately afterwards if we need to. This is the biggest piece. There's a lot to this. There's a lot that we tried to

approach with this at different times and it always comes back to the funding question or came back to the other questions and there's been a lot of -- not enough folks at the meeting, it's gotten canceled for a lot of different reasons. Could we now -- we don't need anybody else outside of the committee just seven people willing to meet at some point in time. I'm in, Josette's in, picking a date.

MS. NEUGEBAUER: . We need to offer it to the other task members too.

MS. RILEY: Doreen would love to be there.

MR. CAMPANO: I think what we need to be. We need at least seven people. Even if it's a work meeting. We may need everybody to vote on it. We can work on it and vote on it that day. Anybody have time in the next week, two weeks? I wouldn't want to go any further than that.

MS. RILEY: I think the week of the 10th I know you don't want to wait that long, but I would think that probably has a little more flexibility. Even if it's not a workday for me, I would still want to do it because it's got to get done.

MR. CAMPANO: The week of the 10th is a recommendation. I don't think we have till June 30th. I'm not sure if this is even going to get in this

session.

MS. CELESTIN: It's not.

MS. NEUGEBAUER: . The report has a deadline date.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: The latest the 12th.

MS. THOMAS: The week of the 10th is better for me.

"This text is being provided in a 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."

4:00 p.m.