

**ILLINOIS STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON THE EDUCATION OF
CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES**

Illinois State Board of Education
Board Room
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Business Meeting
April 14, 2016
12:00 p.m.

I. Procedural Business

Chair Sharon Slover called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. A quorum was present.

ISAC Members Present

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Diane Blair-Sherlock Tiffany Cole <u>via phone</u> Beth Conran <u>via phone</u> Jeannine Cordero <u>via phone</u> Gloria Davis | Keith Dronen Suzanne Lee Ancel Montenelli Jennifer Naddeo Mike Otte | Lauri Phillips <u>via phone</u> Serena Preston Sharon Slover Carrie Snyder Susy Woods |
|--|---|---|

ISAC Members Absent

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Heath Brosseau Tiffany Gholson | Ron Kubalanza Kimberly McClellan | Natalie Neris |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|

ISBE Staff Present

| | | |
|------------|-----------|----------------|
| Dave Andel | Mary Long | Felicia Malloy |
|------------|-----------|----------------|

Guests Present

William Richard sent a letter to Susy Woods who read it on his behalf to the council. You may view his letter at the end of these minutes.

Introductions

Chair Slover welcomed ISAC members and staff and asked that they introduce themselves.

Adoption of Agenda

Motion #1 – Diane Blair Sherlock moved to “adopt the agenda as is.” Susy Woods seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

Approval of Business Meeting Minutes from February 11, 2016.

Motion #2 –Susy Woods moved that “ISAC approve the minutes of February 11, 2016 as presented.” Diane Blair Sherlock seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

II. Public Participation

No public participation.

III. Illinois State Board of Education Update

Grant Updates – Felicia Malloy, Principal Consultant and Tammy Greco, Principal Consultant

The IDEA grants are supplemental federal funds that are generated and allocated to local education agencies based on student population. Illinois school districts, independent charter schools, state run schools, and the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) receive IDEA grants. The IDEA grants flow through the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to special education cooperatives or independent entities (districts, charter schools, state schools, and DJJ).

The Special Education Services Division is responsible for reviewing and approving the IDEA grant applications. Any expenses paid with the IDEA grants must be related (reasonable and necessary) to providing services to students with individualized education programs (IEPs).

IDEA proportionate share requirements apply, so any districts with eligible nonpublic and home schooled students must expended a portion of their IDEA funds to provide services to those students. The grantees must also expend at least 5% of the IDEA funds on IDEA based professional development activities.

As supplemental funds, the grantees must verify annually that the IDEA funds are used for the excess cost of educating students with IEPs and maintain local effort (MOE). Those requirements apply to all Illinois school districts and independent charter schools. The current IDEA MOE process has been in place for several years, the current IDEA excess cost process was put in place during the last fiscal/school year. The Special Education Services Division reviews the IDEA MOE and excess cost worksheets for each individual district and independent charter school.

You will find more updates on Grants under Dave Andel’s various topics below.

Update on Various Topics – Dave Andel, Division Administrator, Special Education Services Division

IDEA Part B Application

The IDEA Part B application was posted for review on the agency website on February 8th for the required 60 days, public comment is being accepted from March 21st through April 29th for the required 30 day comment period. The application is due to the federal government on May 12, 2016. The FY17 award amount is \$516.5M.

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report(SPP/APR)

Indicators 1-16 of the SPP/APR were submitted to OSEP by February 1 as required. Indicator 17 (the SSIP) was submitted to OSEP by April 1 as required. The clarification period for Indicators 1-16 began this week and continues through next week. The clarification period offers states a chance to respond to OSEP questions regarding their SPP/APR and update information as appropriate. ISBE hopes to have a PDF of the SPP/APR available on the ISBE website by the end of April. There is no formal clarification period for Indicator 17. However, OSEP does plan to provide responses to states regarding their SSIPs between May 30 and June 17.

Focused Monitoring

- 13 of 17 Districts have been received their monitoring visits to date, with 6 final reports completed.
- 19 of 27 Chicago Public Schools have received their monitoring visits to date, with 10 final reports completed

LRE Data Cohort VI

Two Seminars have been completed in December 2015 and February 2016.

Five northern districts and five central/south districts are participating in this Cohort.

Cohort VI will reconvene in December 2016 to report out on the implementation of their Action Plans.

Non-public

Non-public team is fully staffed with three consultants. 12 compliance visits have been completed to date. Beginning on March 1, 2016, they are working on bi-annual reviews for approximately 200 programs.

Illinois Multi-tiered System of Supports Network (IL MTSS-N)

- Illinois Rtl Network and ISTAC staff have been aligning and integrating each organization's expertise in systems change and evidence based practices to inform the work of the IL MTSS-N for the past six months. The Network will scale up the legacy work of the Illinois Rtl Network and ISTAC statewide.
- The new RFP for the IL MTSS-N will be posted shortly in which ISBE is braiding the SPDG Part D and IDEA Part B Discretionary funding for a single administrative agent to support the work of the Network.
- Regional Offices of Education (ROEs), Intermediate Service Centers (ISCs), Institutes of Higher Education and Special Education Cooperatives are eligible and encouraged to submit a proposal.

Timely and Meaningful Consultation - Revised ISBE Review Process

We have moved to an audit process and no longer require all districts to submit TMC documents each year. Timely and meaningful consultation (TMC) meetings must still be held by May 31.

- Districts must retain documentation **at the local level** (keep on file a minimum of three years)
- ISBE will audit a portion of the districts each year; those districts will submit documentation to ISBE.

IDEA Proportionate Share Expenditures

Proportionate share expenditures in the IDEA grants are for **services** to eligible students. Supplies and materials alone are not allowable expenditures - must be attached to direct or indirect services for eligible nonpublic students. We realize that the proportionate share amounts can be small, especially at the preschool level. However, the IDEA provides those funds for services to students and that must be the first obligation. Please contact your IDEA grant coordinator with any questions regarding IDEA proportionate share funds or expenditures.

IDEA Grant Timeline

The IDEA grants are provided for the education of students with disabilities during a specific fiscal year, e.g. July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016 for FY16. The IDEA grant coordinators cannot approve end of the year expenditures for the next school year, e.g. classroom supplies/materials. Please be aware of this requirement and budget accordingly to avoid denial of expenditures or potential audit findings. This requirement will be a part of the audit of FY16 grants.

* The timelines also applies to costs for summer conferences, e.g. registration and travel costs for a July, 2016 conference cannot be paid from a grant with a June 30, 2016 end date.

MOE Compliance

MOE Compliance worksheets are being finalized and will be mailed this month. Please work toward resolving any negative MOE as soon as possible. Pam Jurkoshek is currently in the office Monday – Wednesday and should be available through September 30, 2016.

Early Intervention 27-Month List – New Electronic Format

The Special Education Services and Early Childhood Divisions are pleased to announce that the provision of the 27-month list to districts is now available in **electronic format**. This new process will be available online in the Student Information System (SIS) via IWAS, located at www.isbe.net.

The 27-month list notifies districts of children in the Early Intervention program who will be turning three-years-old and may be eligible for special education services in the public school. The list assists districts in ensuring that any eligible children have Individualized Education Program (IEP) services in place by their third birthday.

Previously, the lists were mailed to staff in either a district or special education cooperative. With the online system, staff members who wish to access the report must contact personnel within the district/entity that have access to SIS. Once logged into SIS, access the Reports link. The “*Early Intervention to Early Childhood Special Education Transition*” report is located under the Early Learning category. This report will include all students between 27 and 37 months of age that have been reported from the Department of Human Services and will be refreshed/updated at the beginning of each month.

The online system will reduce costs, paper consumption, and the amount of time needed to provide the lists. It will also allow districts and their special education cooperatives to access the lists for simultaneous viewing. Please direct any questions regarding this matter to Kristy Doan, Early Childhood Education (kdoan@isbe.net 217/524-4835) or Felicia Malloy, Special Education Services (fmalloy@isbe.net 217/782-5589).

Assessment

DLM

Data Lockdown Issues:

- DLM data lockdown has been troublesome for districts in trying to get students ready to be assessed.
- Currently, a meeting is being scheduled with representatives from the IAASE regions who attended the DLM Deep Dive meeting on February 17 to discuss what steps should be taken moving forward. The goal of this meeting is to identify steps districts will need to take in order for students to be assessed and to get a quicker turn around when templates are uploaded to DLM.

- During the lockdown, DLM had a fiber cable cut due to construction on campus. For this reason, the helpdesk is backed logged with requests and technical assistance to all those educators in the consortium. The average wait time for a call to DLM has been about 30 minutes. This issue has been brought to the attention to DLM and they are currently working on a solution to fix the problem.
- The other issue is that only district test coordinators can submit requests to DLM regarding data lockdown templates. When a teacher or a building test coordinator would request a link, the DLM helpdesk was sending those to the requester. When the requestor submits the template, the DLM helpdesk rejects the template because the requestor does not have the correct role. Nancy Keating with DLM has been told that this is a problem and that only the district test coordinator should be sent the link and not any other role. She is looking into the matter and making sure that this does not occur.
- Templates that are submitted have errors and delay the process of getting students into the system. It was brought to DLM's attention that most of the errors are around the Educator Identifier field not having any data. This is not a field that is required when a user is added to the system. For this reason, that field on the template should not be required. However, DLM is still making that field, Educator Identifier, required to fill out for template submission.
- Not the only state in the consortium to have issues with the data lockdown. Others are finding it difficult to get students ready for testing.

DLM Moving forward:

- Assessment Division and Special Education division are working diligently to get students into the system for testing. Staff is answering emails and phone calls in mass amounts. Our support staff is trying to defer calls to DLM. However, DLM is sending some of those calls back to the state.
- Assessment and Special Education division are working with our deep dive group and DLM staff members to find a solution for now and in the future.

Science Assessment

- Illinois Science Assessment is an online based assessment for students in grades 5 and 8 and those who are taking Biology at the high school level.
- Grade 5 and 8 aligned to physical science, life science, earth/space science, and engineering.
 - More information can be found at isbe.net/assessment/isa.htm
- Grade 5: 18 items to answer and an estimated time of 53 minutes to complete the assessment.
- Grade 8: 23 items and an estimated time of 55 minutes to complete the assessment.
- High School: 21 items and an estimated time of 47 minutes to complete the assessment.
- There is no time limit for the science assessment. However, it cannot span over two days.
- Districts have the flexibility to continue testing if students are still working during the session.
- Each test (5, 8, high school) will begin with reading passages, called scenarios, and will be followed by a series of test items. Some items will be open-ended, some will be multiple-choice and some will be multiple-select (more than one correct response). Other items will involve dropdown selections. Each test will also include stand-alone, multiple-choice items that do not follow a scenario.
- ISA offers the following accessibility features (these are only a few):
 - Text to Speech
 - Line Reader
 - Human Reader/Human Signer
 - Small group testing
 - Extended time

- Calculator

SAT

- There is a meeting scheduled for April 14th with the higher learning college board to discuss accommodations and accessibility features for students with a disability.
- They want to discuss giving students with a disabilities college entrance scores with more accommodations than ACT would allow.

PA 98-859 Physical Fitness Assessments in Schools

School will use a physical fitness assessment for grades 3 through 12 and report fitness information to ISBE to assess student fitness indicators. Section 1.425(g) add recommendations regarding the use of the Fitnessgram or Brockport Physical Fitness Testing for students with disabilities whose IEPs identify the Fitnessgram as not appropriate. ISBE is updating the assessment section of IEP forms to reflect this requirement. IEP teams will make the determination whether a student with an IEP takes the Fitnessgram; the Brockport; or due to the severity of their disability would be exempt from testing.

School Nurses

- All RNs licenses come up for renewal in May of 2016 (May of even years). HR or supervisors of RNs should require RNs to provide an updated license by June 1 or before reporting to work for 2016-17 school year. During the time that a license is lapsed, a nurse is not able to provide any services reserved to a nurse or sign any documents with RN. (LPN licenses are renewed in odd years).
- A nurse who also holds a PEL endorsement in school nursing, if that license is up for renewal this summer, they only need to verify that they have met the PD requirements of the IDFPR RN license. They do not need to enter individual CPDU. Nurses are being provided the technical details of how to enter the information into ELIS through various list serves and emails. They may contact Jessica Gerdes if they need more information.
- By June 30, all RNs who have completed credentials for IEP should have the credential listed in ELIS as a Designation.
- Nurses signing into IEP meetings as school nurse should identify themselves by name, RN, and add either "PEL" or "IEP designee". Although other nurses, similar to other staff personnel, may attend IEP meetings if needed/requested, no other RN may sign as the authorized nurse for completing Medical Review evaluations.
- To date, 605 RNs have qualified for IEP designee through coursework, and about a dozen others have qualified by content test. Another 120 are set to begin the Medical Review course April 13.
- After June 30, if a district or coop needs another RN with the credential to complete the entirety of Medical Review (authorization to sign as IEP designee), the district must first seek the services of a PEL holding RN. If unable to attract a suitable candidate, the district or coop may provide that documentation to ISBE and send an RN holding a bachelor's degree in either nursing or education, or a related field, to the course or to the test option.
- Districts have inquired about rule 226.860(k), which took effect January 2016, regarding restrictions on nursing activities performed by non-nurses. The rule clarifies rule 1.760(h) and is in line with current health care licensing laws issued by IDFPR (Illinois Dept. of Financial and Professional Regulation), which licenses almost all professions besides teaching.
- ISBE has received a few calls regarding eligibility for home or hospital instruction. A new FAQ and form regarding students who are eligible for homebound or hospital instruction is posted on ISBE at http://isbe.net/school_health.htm and at <http://www.isbe.net/funding/html/specialed.htm>. Some key points: Schools do not need to accept the services of a hospital tutor if they prefer a district tutor instead. Schools do not need to pay a hospital for tutoring before the statement of medical

eligibility is submitted to the district and the teacher position is agreed upon. Districts are not required to wait any number of days to begin tutoring once the statement of eligibility is received.

Director's Conference 2016

The Directors' Conference will be held in Springfield on August 3-5, 2016 at the Crowne Plaza, Springfield. We are currently developing workshops and inviting presenters. Thank you to Lea Anne Frost for sharing the IAASE Winter Conference recommendations for future conferences survey, we are Pre-registration cost will remain the same as last year at \$150.00 Thank you, to Lea Anne Frost for sharing the IAASE Winter Conference – "Recommendations for future conferences survey", which is extremely helpful in developing the conference. A save the date flyer will be coming out shortly.

- Status of new hires and open positions in Springfield and Chicago.

Springfield

- Cynthia Knight will begin on May 1, 2016 to fill the parent engagement Principal Consultant
- 9 open positions for LEA Focused Monitoring Principal Consultant
- 2 open positions for IDEA Grant coordinators Principal Consultant
- 1 open position for Charter School/Surrogate Parent Principal Consultant
- 1 open position for Support Staff Receptionist
- 1 new Request to add School Nurse/Mental health Principal Consultant Chicago
- Jacqueline Hammond for Non-Public Monitoring Principal Consultant began on March 16th.
- 2 open positions for CPS Focused Monitoring Principal Consultant
- 1 open support staff position

Committee reports can be found at the end of the minutes.

Executive – Sharon Slover, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time.

Access – Diane Blair Sherlock, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time.

Bilingual – Jennifer Naddeo and Ancel Montenelli, Co-Chairs – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time.

Comprehensive State Plan – Susy Woods, Chair –. No meeting was held so there is no report at this time.

Family Communications – Beth Conran, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time..

Finance – Mike Otte, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time..

General Supervision/Due Process – Diane Blair Sherlock, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time.

Legislation – Susy Woods, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time..

Personnel Development – Suzanne Lee, Chair – See report at the end of these minutes.

Rules and Regulations – Suzanne Lee, Chair – No meeting was held so there is no report at this time.

Transition – Beth Conran, Chair – See report at the end of these minutes.

IV. Old Business

Annual Report

V. New Business

Motion #3 – Diane Blair Sherlock moved that “ISAC adjourn. Carrie Snyder seconded the motion. **The motion carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.

ISAC Personnel Development Committee
Thursday, March 31, 2016
3:30 p.m.

Present: Suzanne Lee, Beth Conran, Lauri Phillips, Susy Woods

A phone meeting was held to review materials from the ISBE - CEEDAR State Leadership Team's endorsement options. The intent was to discuss possible design of endorsement structures for special education teachers. All members participating in the call had an opportunity to ask questions and share personal perspectives. Beth Conran, the appointed ISAC representative to the State Leadership Team, shared that she would take feedback to the upcoming State Leadership Team Meeting.

ISAC Transition
Wednesday, April 13, 2016
10:00 a.m.

Present: Diane J. Blair-Sherlock, Sharon Slover, Serena Preston,
Jeanine Cordero and Lauri Phillips

Discussion was held on Employment First and the dissemination of the Report from the Employment First transition work group. Sharon presented that the report may be dissemination to ISAC members to weigh in and for comment and the subcommittee will try and meet prior to the ISAC meeting on 4/14/16 to address any items which we wish to comment on.

The subcommittee discussed the rule 226 changes but will table that discussion for the June meeting. In the interim Diane will try and get specifics to the Subcommittee members.

Lauri brought up concerns with her school district's intention to house their transitions program in a local residence not on the school campus. Discussion was had on concerns that this program would facilitate segregation of these students from their non disabled peers and whether or not such a program would benefit all those in the transition programs. This item will be placed on the next agenda for further discussion.

Jeanine presented a tool that she has disseminated to the members of ISAC today that was created by Equip for Equality to aid in transition planning. Jeanine would appreciate any feedback or comment on this tool as she sits on the board and will take these comments back to them.

The meeting is adjourned, with anticipation that members will have an additional meeting as referenced earlier in the minutes.

Letter from William Richard

Hello,

My name is William Richard and I am a parent of a 9 yr old girl who has been diagnosed with auditory processing disorder, anxiety and dyslexia. She is in 3rd grade in Springfield District 186. Her dibels score was a 33 at the last report card yet at the emergency IEP meeting she had a dibels score of 60. In case you wanted to know what that means is she should be at 110 at the end of the year and the 60 puts her back in 1st grade level. Her DRA is at 16 which from the information found online that puts her reading at a 1st grade level. Let me first explain that we love the school and every one there. They do make an effort to help my daughter without myself or my wife having to fight. My issue is with more the district and the lack of accommodations being made for my daughter and any child who cannot decode print and is far below grade level reading. The Springfield District 186 made a very clear stand that my daughter does not qualify for the human reader even after I showed them the exact text from the PARCC guidelines. They kept going back and emphasizing the word "unable" which to them she could decode print since her dibels score was 33. I fought to have the human reader by pointing out that she cannot decode at grade level and she can't even read at grade level. I am going to copy the exact text from the PARCC guidelines and ISBE refers to this in other documents too. This is the section, "The purpose of the embedded text-to-speech, ASL video, and human reader/human signer accommodation for the PARCC ELA/literacy assessment is to provide access to printed or written texts on the PARCC ELA/literacy assessments for a very small number of students with print related disabilities who would otherwise be unable to participate in the assessment because their disability severely limits or prevents their ability to access printed text by decoding. This accommodation is not intended for students reading somewhat (i.e., only moderately) below grade level"

If I give you a passage in Mandarin right now and replaced all sight words to English, could you read that passage enough to infer and comprehend so that you can answer questions? Hopefully not everyone in the room speaks and reads fluent Mandarin and will be unable to read the passage enough to infer or comprehend the passage. This is a very good analogy of what it would be like for my daughter to read a 3rd grade passage and answer questions. We all know that if a child cannot read at grade level and cannot decode text then there would be no way that the child could do well. This will leave my child and any other child in a similar situation walking away feeling unintelligent and defeated. I opted out of the reading section of the test for my daughter. The IEP team offered that because they could tell that we would never agree that our child could read at grade level and decode text. When we requested an emergency IEP team meeting to discuss PARCC accommodations the Supervisor of my daughter' IEP case manager attended with one purpose. That purpose was to control the meeting and make sure that the accommodation would be denied. This supervisor who has never attended any of my child's IEP meetings in the 6 years now was sitting across the table and doing about 90% of the talking. I knew that the supervisor was there to make sure that the accommodation that my wife and I were asking for would not be given. I emailed ISBE with questions and I received very vague answers and most ended with "the IEP team will need to make that decision". One of those emails the person stated that less than 5% of all students in the state would receive that accommodation which I asked the question back to him "How do you know that percentage if you are leaving it up to the IEP team?"

I know another parent with a child who is in a similar situation in this district but at a different school. They are doing the exact same thing and her dibels score is lower and the child cannot decode text. Yet, the district uses the same language which is kind of scary. The district says that the child can do 22 words per minute therefore she can decode. No one is wanting to bring up the fact that most of the words read correctly in the dibels test are sight words. Words that are memorized not decoded. This

child like my own child cannot take a new word never seen before and sound it out. Why does PARCC make mention of a human reader when not one district plans to offer it? Why force a test on a child that will leave them walking away feeling like crap? This district like many others are being told to keep this accommodation number down and parents know it. We are not stupid and neither are our children. If the parts that tests comprehension are testing children who cannot decode print or read at grade level than what are the results? Are these results meaningful? My child did not ask for the opt out but we as parents were given the choice. I made that choice to protect my daughter and to not put here through the reading tests. I would rather my child not participate if the accommodations will not be made. If these tests are being used to assess these children and the proper accommodations are not being met than there will be no clear picture of that child's progress. The Federal and State government needs a lesson on providing true assessment tools instead of forcing children to take tests that will not measure accurately.

ISAC Transition
Thursday, April 28, 2016
9:00 a.m. via phone

Present: Diane J. Blair-Sherlock, Sharon Slover, Serena Preston, Ancel Montenelli, Carrie Snyder and Lauri Phillips

Discussion was held on Employment First and the dissemination of the Report from the Employment First transition work group. Sharon gave some background on the report and its intended purposes

Ancel expressed concern with respect to meaningful transitions and ensuring the delivery of those services on an earlier time schedule than is currently being done by the schools. Further, concern was expressed over parents understanding of the process and who is responsible for monitoring the transitions to post high school. Ancel questioned who would be proactive on educate students on the Employments Rights on Reasonable Accommodations.

Serena suggested that a transitional training program be created to provide schools with annual updates and training on transitional education and the laws with respect to same. Something along the lines of an annual conference.

Serena also expressed concern about the unfunded aspects of the report and how their implementation would be funded.

Serena also suggested the potential for creation of a certification course, not dissimilar to the program created for nurses, which would provide certifications for transitions specialists. The committee members believe this is a good idea and would like to advance this idea for further consideration.

Diane suggested considering specific outlines of transitional goals for IEP's to give the schools more specific direction as to the items that should be being considered in the transitions process. She further suggested providing parents at 14 1/2 with more information and tools to navigate the process. Also concern was expressed about transitioning to institutions of higher education in collaboration with the high schools, as well as, the costs of additional services in higher ed.

Carrie expressed concern about the impact on the ability to obtain employment with a certificate of completion as opposed to a diploma. Given the nature of electronic applications the concern is the potential loss of consideration due to not having a "diploma". The committee believes this is an issue that needs further consideration and inquiry and this matter will be on the agenda for our next meeting.

The members were encouraged to re-review the Employment First Memo previously supplied and submit their suggestions to Diane and/or Sharon.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.