State Advisory Panel

October 23, 2019

Minutes

**Present:**

Courtney Angelosante

Ann Belanger

Brian Cavanaugh

Shawn Collier

Jodie Hall

Sherreccia Jackson

Nancy Lander

Valerie Mattes

Artulean McKenna

Sue Nay

Gwen Sartoris

Carrie Woodcock

**1. Open Comment**

**2. Voting on Disproportionality, Shawn Collier**

 A. The following issues were discussed:

* Cell Size – Target Group
* End Size – Comparison Group Size
* Risk Ratio – How many more times is one group identified than the others combined
* Multi Year flexibility
* Reasonable progress – reduction of any amount in risk group each year
* The Department would still look at districts that appear disproportionate, even if federally they are not.

B. There was some concern of districts not expecting lack of budgeted funds if found disproportionate and be blindsided by this. There was further concern that the 15 % reallocation of funds would impact students directly. The 15% reallocation of funds could be used towards training, evaluation, services and supports.

C. Utilizing a new risk ratio size and using multiyear flexibility for one year would allow for an awareness of the standard without crippling a district that was inappropriately labeled as being disproportionate. The Panel has a desire to support districts, while still holing disproportionate districts accountable.

*Voting:(A letter will be drafted to the Department to recommend the following)*

Increase Risk Ratio to 3.5 and add the multiyear flexibility: 1

*Increase Risk Ratio to 3.5 and add the multiyear flexibility for one year only: 7*

Multiyear model only: 0

Do or change nothing: 0

**3. OSEP’s request to gather input on for 2019 – 2020 Annual Performance Report, Shawn Collier**

 A. The Department of Education wishes to extend current targets for one more year, following this, the Panel will be asked to assist in establishing a new future 3-year target.

B. Shawn distributed a handout of current targets to be thought about and revisited next month.

**4. State Advisory Panel Bylaws, Ann Belanger**

Changes proposed:

 A. Membership –

Added seats organized by Superintendent regions

 B. Add a representative from the in-State Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)

C. Voting will occur next month

***Open Comment:***

Recommendation to use Zoom for meetings, instead of a telephone conference line

Mileage is reimbursed at 44 cents per mile

Should we reflect member terms in the bylaws, which is currently 1-3 years on a rotating basis, with subsequent 3-year terms and verbiage on change of seat members?

Language on number 1 to reflect 3 – 26, instead of birth – 26.

As there is no age specified, the possibility of recruiting a youth with a disability was discussed.

**5. Alternate Assessments, Sue Nay**

Sue came to the Panel requesting input regarding alternate assessments and her presentation for this. The below changes were recommended:

* Pages 4-5: *Which would be easier for parents to understand*? Page 4 diploma verbiage should be included so that parents know to ask their district first. Recommended to take out page 5’s specific statute numbers and to add verbiage on the 1% that should or could be using alternate assessment.
* Page 6 – Members liked this slide but felt it was not needed.
* Page 7 – 9 – Add that having a significant cognitive disability is an IEP determination and add clarification that a general assessment can be modified or accommodated for a student, instead of using an alternative assessment.
* Changing “many” to “some students” on page 9.
* Change verbiage on page 9 regarding grade level – Kids can access the same grade level just in difference ways/with accommodations.
* Page 10 – MSAA – Add the early stop option into the slide, since it is different than opting out. Over all, the Panel felt that assessments should be used to collect data but should not be used to assess where kids are at. The suggestion was made to change the slide to bullets, instead of paragraphs.
* Page 14 – Possibly add how many other states (10) use this assessment.
* Page 18 – *Delete or keep?* – Keep
* Page 19 – Encouraged to have a quote from a special education teacher, that does not base present performance levels on these assessments. Testimony should mention funding as well. Not having enough students testing in the main assessments could mean a lack of funding. Nancy Smith, a teacher in Kennebunk, was a suggestion for a teacher testimonial.
* Page 20 – Reword second point or remove it – Regardless of the report, parents should be talking with teachers about achievement. This statement puts too much weight on the assessments.
* Page 21 – Check the monetary value to reflect the actual amount, as opposed to an estimate, and add the 1% student figure into the slide.
* Page 22 – The Panel felt it best to leave this slide out, as it may cause confusion.

Sue will email a copy of the new PowerPoint to members. The goal is also to have this accessible on a website and accessible by people with hearing impairment.

***Open comment:***

MSAA is on year 5 and more training would be encouraged.

Early stopping point is crucial.

**6. Open Comment**

A. Discussion on legislation moving forward –

B. Nothing new is known; most bills are currently carryover from last session including a Restrain and Seclusion bill and several Child Development Services (CDS) bills.

 C. The RFP for assessing CDS legislation was discussed, specifically how they are designed to gain further information that is currently missing or unknown.

 D. CDS finished last year in a much better financial standing than previous years. Some contributors to this include:

* + Parents providing transportation for reimbursement
	+ CDS has been working with public schools for more cost-effective transportation
	+ Renegotiation of nonstandard provider rates
	+ Some additional funding provided last year by the legislature

E. CDS will continue to work on improving its financial status.

**Next meeting is scheduled for November 20, 2019 in room 600**